NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLIX.

OCTOBER, 1910.

FRIGGA.

FROM "BALDUR THE BEAUTIFUL."

BY GRACE DENIO LITCHFIELD.

GREAT Mother-Heart, one with infinity,
And old when stars were young,
Though all the gods together sang of thee,
The best were still unsung.

The surge of myriad seas is in thy veins.
Thy rhythmic pulses beat
Harmonious with Heaven's eternal strains.
Its winds are in thy feet.

Ruthless as Fate thou art; a fierce typhoon
When worlds thy path defy;
Yet tender as the touch of summer moon
Where sleeping lilies lie.

Oh, love transcendent, vast as breadth and length
Of space beyond the spheres,
And mighty with the garnered grace and strength
Of all the mingled years!

Copyright, 1910, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As o'er the land 'twixt widest east and west
The wings of Day are spread,
So life lies folded to thine ample breast,
Nourished and comforted.

FRIGGA'S DIRGE.

FROM "BALDUR THE BEAUTIFUL."

WEEP, weep for Baldur dead!
For light, for beauty sped!
For fairness from all fair things fled!
Gone is our summer with its flush of flowers,
Its purpled plains,
Its sunset stains.
Gone are its brooks, that babbled in green bowers,
Its misted dawns, its scented dews and showers,
Its rainbowed rains—
The glory of its golden hours
Endarkened wholly.
Gone, gone our light of life and love!
No more the iris-breasted dove,
Melodiously melancholy,
Croons o'er its plaint within the curtained grove.
No daring wing the distance cleaves.
No moth its gossamer shroud unweaves.
No wind-awakened, lisping leaves
Whisper their pleasure o'er and o'er
As Day unbars her lattice door,
Night swooning at her knee;
No more the sunbeam's glittering ball
Rebounds from silver shield and wall,
Drops from the dome o'er Gimli's Hall,
Or flashes from the sea.
No more! no more!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evil hath laid its curse
Across our universe.
Lost is the god whom we implore.
Gloom and despair
Foul fruitage bear,
And ice sheets cover
The stark worlds over.
Unstarred our eves; unsunned our noons;
Silent our skalds; forgot our runes;
Daytime and night are one.
Adown the desperate years
We call with steadfast tears.
No bitterer Hel can be
Than Heaven, missing thee,
Baldur—our life! our sun!

GRACE DENIO LITCHFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW POLITICS.

THE ISSUES.

BY WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

To a superficial view there is little in the present state of our public affairs to suggest the notion of any marked transition. There are no wars or rumors of wars; even the prophecies and forebodings of that sort of excitement seem to lack conviction. They are but mildly lugubrious, and yield few shudders. Peace reigns—and prosperity, which is tamer still. Nor is there any "malice domestic" that looks particularly threatening. Sectional jealousies, though occasionally stirred, do not leap into flame. Party feeling, as between the two great parties, has seldom been so weak. Exciting and dramatic personal rivalries are equally wanting. There is nothing, for instance, to compare with the long confrontments of Jefferson and Hamilton, of Clay and Jackson, of Douglas and Lincoln. There is, indeed, a vigorous and heated struggle between two factions in one of the great parties, and the two wings of the other great party may soon follow suit and favor us with a set-to; but neither division has as yet gone far enough to produce changes that can be regarded as clearly revolutionary.

But great changes in the political life of a people do not always come violently, dramatically. Some of the greatest have come, like those in nature, quietly. There is, I believe, a feeling among thoughtful men that such a change is in fact coming over our political life to-day; and very good reasons may be given for this view.

Twenty-two years ago, Mr. Bryce, coming to the end of his "American Commonwealth," had this to say about the future:

"America, in her swift onward progress, sees, looming on the horizon and now no longer distant, a time of mists and shadows, wherein dangers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be concealed whose form and magnitude she can scarcely yet conjecture. As she fills up her Western regions with inhabitants, she sees the time approach when all the best land will have been occupied, and when the land now under cultivation will have been so far exhausted as to yield scantier crops even to more expensive culture. Although transportation may also have then become cheaper, the price of food will rise; farms will be less easily obtained and will need more capital to work them with profit; the struggle for existence will become more severe. And while the outlet which the West now provides for the overflow of the great cities will have become less available, the cities will have grown immensely more populous; pauperism, now confined to some six or seven of the greatest, will be more widely spread; wages will probably sink and work be less abundant. In fact, the chronic evils and problems of old societies and crowded countries, such as we see them to-day in Europe, will have reappeared on this new soil."

More than eighty years ago—that is to say, sixty years before Mr. Bryce's forecast—Macaulay, who never saw America, writing a reply to John Stuart Mill's essay on government, and controverting Mill's view that monarchies and aristocracies are always more rapacious than democracies, introduced this striking passage:

"Despots, we see, do plunder their subjects, though history and experience tell them that, by prematurely exacting the means of profusion, they are in fact devouring the seed-corn from which the future harvest of revenue is to spring. Why then should we suppose that the people will be deterred from procuring immediate relief and enjoyment by the fear of distant calamities—of calamities which perhaps may not be fully felt till the times of their grandchildren? . . . . . .

"The case of the United States is not in point. In a country where the necessaries of life are cheap and the wages of labor high, where a man who has no capital but his legs and arms may expect to become rich by industry and frugality, it is not very decidedly even for the immediate advantage of the poor to plunder the rich; and the punishment of doing so would very speedily follow the offence. But in countries in which the great majority live from hand to mouth, and in which vast masses of wealth have been accumulated by a comparatively small number, the case is widely different. The immediate want is, at particular seasons, craving, imperious, irresistible. In our own time it has steeled men to the fear of the gallows, and urged them on the point of the bayonet. And, if these men had at their command that gallows, and those bayonets, which now scarcely restrain them, what is to be expected? Nor is this state of things one which can exist only under a bad government. . . . Therefore, the better the government, the greater is the inequality of conditions; and the greater the inequality of conditions the stronger are the motives which impel the populace to spoliation. As for America, we appeal to the twentieth century."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Twentieth Century is upon us. Mr. Bryce named thirty years as the period which, in the opinion of the best judges, still intervened between the America he was writing about and the coming of the time when Americans would find themselves confronted with the questions which had already long beset older and more crowded countries. That period is not yet exhausted; but the pace of our American advance has been accelerated. I think we can hardly doubt that certain new public issues which within the last two or three years have come very swiftly to the front are such as both Mr. Bryce in 1888 and Macaulay in 1829 foresaw that we should ultimately have to face; that they have come to stay; that the present time *is* therefore transitional—much more truly so than many periods which have seemed so mainly because they have been disturbed and exciting. We are not yet, it is true, an old society or a crowded country. But—the frontier is gone. With the admission of Arizona and New Mexico, the famous Senate Committee on Territories becomes a committee on Alaska alone. We are in the situation of a man who, though still very young, has nevertheless reached maturity and come into full possession of his estate; of an estate vast indeed—vaster than that of any of his neighbors—but yet of a vastness no longer incalculable, no longer uncalculated, and which is also appreciably impaired by the waste and extravagance of his youth. We face, therefore, the duties and responsibilities of maturity, of a more careful development and husbandry of our great demesne. The time of boundless anticipation is past. We have, instead, a sure sense of strength, but with it comes also, at last, the sense that even our strength, and our capacity for growth, have their limits. There is as yet no real pinch, no hemming in, no severe pressure or congestion; far from it. But the certainty that these things are in the future is at last borne in upon us by facts and by wise warnings. That is enough, like the young man's first vivid confrontment with the mere knowledge of his limitations, to change our mood. Were we asked if our characteristic cheerfulness and hopefulness is not damped, we might still reply, "Not a jot, not a jot!" But we are indisputably taking up, and ought to be taking up, certain of the problems of "old societies and crowded countries"; and the coming of these new problems, these new issues, has somewhat changed the aspect of certain others which, even with us, are old.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is much to hearten us as we enter upon the new epoch. As we turn to the questions, new and old, which now confront us, we can feel that certain other questions, certain whole classes of questions, in fact, which have at other times sorely tried free governments, do not now confront us at all. There are, for instance, the political troubles which have sprung from differences in religion—the very bitterest in history. It surely may be counted an immense triumph of democracy that these have for us practically ceased to exist. And it is so, too, with certain other fundamental things. Besides religious freedom, we have freedom of speech and of the press. Some very serious evils have, it is true, appeared in the press. It is badly commercialized. Its tone is frequently very low, and one does not, as a rule, find it governed by any high sense of responsibility. But it is still, as a whole, an invaluable safeguard. Whatever problems we have to face, we can discuss them with very great freedom. We obey Milton's injunction concerning Truth: "Give her but room, and do not bind her when she sleeps." In that alone is an immeasurable security and hope. To say that we are also free from the political troubles and perplexities that spring from differences of race would be going too far. But I think we may say that those troubles and perplexities are to-day less acute, less threatening, less hampering and depressing, than they have ever been before. The sin and blunder of slavery is ended—is even, let us hope, atoned for. The mistake and wrong of Reconstruction is undone. Much, very much, remains to be done by way of adjustment, arrangement, education, justice; but the temper in which we consider these things is vastly improved. I believe that most thoughtful men, if they should examine their own minds concerning this entire matter, would confess themselves more hopeful to-day than they have ever been—more hopeful than, a few decades ago, it seemed possible that they would ever be.

We can, therefore, turn to our new issues exceptionally free-handed, and with the good spirit that comes of substantial progress in free government.

The new issues all have this much in common: They are all at bottom economic, and economic in a very strict derivative sense of the word—all questions of national housekeeping, of the safeguarding, the development, and the distribution of our im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mense national inheritance. John Sherman said long ago that nine-tenths of the legislation of peace is the legislation of finance, and if finance be taken in its fullest meaning that is truer to-day than when he said it. I am not sure that it has not also always been true; but the rapid and revolutionary development of the means, and the swift widening of the scale, of production and transportation—the marvellous extension of the principle of combination into every branch of industry and business—this change has transformed bewilderingly the entire field with which economic legislation must deal. It is not merely that we are approaching "the problems of old societies and crowded countries." Those problems have taken on for us new aspects, aspects hardly known elsewhere, and a truly American vastness of range. We can and should profit by a close study of European and Asiatic experience. The way we are at last coming to study that experience is perhaps the most convincing, as it is the most natural, manifestation of our changing temper. But the guidance we can get from the older countries, however valuable, is limited. There are things we must work out for ourselves—in which we must ourselves be guides and pioneers; for the new industry, the new ways in business and finance, are much farther advanced with us, and much more firmly established, than with the older peoples.

The particular new issue on which we can get the most guidance from Europe, and which is therefore the simplest of all, is that of conservation. To call that issue a question would be a misnomer. It is not a question at all — unless there is a question between economy and extravagance. To state it should be, so far as public opinion is concerned, to answer it. No one, I suppose, would have the hardihood to affirm that we ought to waste our patrimony instead of husbanding it, or that we ought to consume those natural resources which, like the forests and the soil's energy, are capable of self-maintenance and of increase, faster than they can be restored. The only question should be of ways and means, and concerning these it will be some time before we exhaust the enlightenment to be got from European experience. The very recent date of the beginnings of scientific forestry among us is perhaps the best illustration of how much we can learn and must learn from that experience—and of how amazingly we have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neglected it. It is hardly twenty years since Mr. Pinchot and the other pioneers began their work in this country; but in Germany, in France, in Switzerland, the care and culture of the forests have been a national concern for centuries. Their systems were thorough and elaborate before ours was begun. The German forests are valued at half a billion dollars. The French forests yield annually an average of two dollars the acre. Those of Switzerland are, if anything, even more carefully conserved and cultivated. With us, there was actually no law whatever providing for forest reservations until 1891. In the matter of the national conservation of the use of water-power, we have in the example of Switzerland a still more admirable—a practically perfect—object-lesson. There is not a considerable waterfall in the Alps whose force is not carefully calculated. Already a great part of the light and heat and power used by the Swiss people is supplied by government from this source.

Concerning these things, therefore, there is hardly a question; but there is an issue; there is a conflict, a struggle; and the violence and magnitude and difficulty of it are greater than anywhere else in the world. That is so because nowhere else in the world are private interests so well organized or so powerful, and nowhere else have they had such opportunities to acquire control of the various means of wealth. There is thus an issue, more and more sharply defined, between the permanent public weal and the selfishness of individuals and groups. The mere wastefulness of the public itself, culpable as it has of course been, does not seriously threaten to turn into that spoliation by the people which Macaulay apprehended; but the accumulation of vast wealth by a few, which he also predicted,—that has come, and on a scale beyond his wildest dream. There has also come a massing together of both great and little accumulations, and an organization of capital and industry under a few heads, which he apparently did not foresee at all, so that the struggle is not so much against the appetites and immediate desires of the mass of the people as it is a struggle on behalf of the people against the combinations. To take an instance which at once suggests itself, the lumber kings were not so slow as the rest of us to see how rapidly the country was being deforested. Mr. Pinchot did not need to take violent measures to arouse them to the situation. Mr. Pinchot, in fact, taught them nothing on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject. They had already looked ahead, and were buying timber lands everywhere. Whether or not a similar concerted effort has been made to monopolize the country's water-power has been questioned; but it can hardly be questioned that, law and usage remaining what they are, the same forces which have made for monopoly and against competition in other things—in steel, in mineral oil, in anthracite coal, and the rest—will accomplish this huge monopoly as well.

The swift and universal rise of prices from which we now suffer will be really a blessing if it shall serve to awaken us completely to the actual state of industry and exchange among us. Our awakening to the necessity of economy, of conservation, important as it is in itself, is still but a part of the greater awakening to the true extent of the changes that have come about in our industrial life; it is but a rubbing of the eyes to what we shall see when we are fully aroused. The field is so vast that only a superficial glance at the main features of the new order is here possible; but sometimes the swift eye-sweep will yield enlightenment not to be won by a minute and piecemeal observation.

The most striking and important fact—a fact which is in a way inclusive of the whole matter—is this: Competition, as we have known it in the past, the kind of competition on whose existence and continuance our law and usage concerning industry and concerning property are largely based, is breaking down. From many industries it has already practically disappeared. Take any one of dozens of articles of general consumption, and thorough investigation will very likely disclose that real and vital competition no longer prevails in its production or in its transportation or in its wholesale or even its retail distribution. From whomsoever one buys it, one is really patronizing a trust or other combination. A combination of manufacturers makes it, a combination of common carriers fixes the charges for transporting it to the market, the original combination names the terms on which the retail dealers may handle it—the main condition frequently being that they shall not handle competing products at all—and the ultimate consumer is lucky if a combination of the dealers themselves does not fix the minimum price at which he can buy it. That such combinations of mere retailers exist in the great centres, and that there exists also the control or owner-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship of groups and chains of shops by the manufacturers themselves, has for some time been known. If our present investigations of prices go deep enough and far enough, I am sure they will also disclose such combinations in the smaller communities as well. The dependence of ordinary shopkeepers on the trusts or other combinations which supply their particular wares—such, for instance, as that of the butchers on the meat trust—is so wide-spread that in this respect the old law of competition has been, in large measure, not merely nullified but reversed. Instead of individual manufacturers competing for sales to individual shopkeepers, who in turn compete among themselves for the consumers' favor, we have the shopkeepers compelled to restrict their business to the products of a group of manufacturers and taking their revenge by themselves combining against the consumer. The consumers, in fact, seem to be the only industrial group which has so far failed altogether to combine.

Illustrations are so abundant that one hesitates which to choose. Perhaps the tobacco business, since it was one of the first to yield to the principle of combination, will do as well as any other; but what is true of that business is true of so many others that it is necessary, in justice, to emphasize that it is taken merely as an illustration—that nothing invidious is meant by the choice.

The history of that business since the principle of combination, the trust principle, was first applied to it exhibits plainly all the features of the new order which have been mentioned, except, possibly, the voluntary combination of the retail dealers in particular communities. There was first practically unlimited competition among the manufacturers, then the union of several companies in a corporation stronger than any of its rivals; then the sort of competition that never lasts, and which led simply to successive absorptions of all sorts of independent concerns by the original combination, the names of the various independent brands being, however, frequently retained; then the invasion by the trust of branches of the business in which it had not originally engaged; then—or perhaps sooner—the taking of measures for the control of the retail trade, such as the setting up of chain stores and the practical compelling of retail dealers to handle only the trust's wares. Other means to overcome competition were doubtless employed, but these were the chief. And they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been so effective as to leave the consumer in large measure at the mercy of the combination. If he insists on buying a particular brand of tobacco formerly manufactured by independents, he is very likely to find either that it is no longer manufactured at all or that it is now really manufactured by the trust—in which case the quality of the product has very probably been changed. Of course, some independent concerns are still doing business, and it is always possible to obtain their wares if the consumer prefers them and is willing to take the trouble to use the mails. The monopoly is not complete. But in respect of by far the greater part of the demand for tobacco in all its various forms it has almost come to the point where the men in control of the bulk of the business can say to the consumer: "You can no longer choose for yourself what you will have. You must take what we supply."

Again let me repeat that I have mentioned this business merely as an illustration. Many other industries that would serve equally well as illustrations instantly come to mind. In fact, what does not come promptly to mind, what is getting harder and harder to find, is the industry, the business, of which what is true of this one is not either already true or plainly by way of becoming true. One can scarcely pick up a paper without encountering the announcement that the same principle has been extended in some form to some new field. A combination of "general" stores in certain cities, and a practically nation-wide combination of bakeries, are the freshest instances. It is impossible not to feel that the tendency is so universal as to mean unmistakably a new industrial order.

What does the change mean for the individual, not as consumer, not as in any sense a mere observer or outsider, for that can be the lot only of a number so small as to be negligible, but as a part and member, an industrial unit, of the new order, the new system? Clearly, it means, and it must continue to mean until the system is somewhat modified in the interest of the individual, less independence, a narrower range of opportunity. There is no reason to believe that it means on the whole less comfort or a lowered standard of living. The contrary is more probably true. The economies in most of the combinations doubtless outnumber and outweigh the losses, not from the point of view of the producers only, but from that of the entire community

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well. Neither does the change mean that the man of ability and ambition cannot rise. He can. A policy of promotions for merit is plainly to the interest of every great business. The great combinations have almost universally adopted that policy, and they follow it far more consistently than government does. That is a principal reason why they are so well served. But that these things are so does not rid us of the fact that the coming of the new order has meant a real loss of independence, of industrial freedom, to the great mass of individuals. Their chance to rise is a chance to rise in but one way—by obedience to the laws of the systems to which they belong; and in the making of those laws they have had no voice. There is real independence only at the top; and to reach the top is beyond the hopes of any but a very, very few. In this respect the new order is, perhaps, more like the military system than anything else. Clearly, it is less democratic, less in accord with the democratic ideal, less conducive to the democratic spirit and temper, than the old.

But to get a fuller conception of the change, and how great it is, we must go higher. We must go to the source of initiative and control in business as it has come to be carried on in America; that is to say, to the men who direct the capital of the country. For the principle of combination has certainly not withheld itself from the sources of industrial energy any more than it has from particular industries. Of the announcements of mergers and combines which one sees so constantly, none are more significant than those concerning banks and trust companies in the great centres. To these there have also of late been added reports from the West of the formation of chains of banks in the smaller places, covering whole States or parts of two or three States—not the branch bank arrangement of England and Canada, but veritable bank trusts, controlling the main supply of capital for great regions. I suppose it was the insurance investigations of a few years ago that first revealed how it has been possible for a few great capitalists to get control of the accumulated savings of hundreds of thousands of people of small means. Those investigations did not, however, lead to any comprehensive plan for arresting the process. It has not stopped, but gone on. According to a recent estimate, a single great banking concern is charged with the practical direction of some six billion dollars, variously invested—in manufactures, in banking, in transporta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, in mines, in many other ways. To say that we already have a dominant, all-controlling money trust would be going too far. But it is not too much to say that the forces of the age make for such a consummation, that, our law and usage remaining as they are, that also is fairly sure to come about.

The possibility, taken with the vastness of our extent and our wealth, is staggering. Four centuries ago, the Medici were masters of Florence because they were supreme there in finance; but Florence at her best was but a city of perhaps one hundred thousand inhabitants, with a territory far smaller than that of our average single State. If, therefore, the Medici could make themselves so great a place in history, and play so great a part in the life of their time, what might not they do who should establish even a like control over the limitless industry, the incalculable opulence, of America? In the presence of such power, how could democracy survive? Such power could go far to corrupt the press. Less power has, in fact, already gone far to corrupt the press. Less power has already corrupted Legislatures; has suborned executives; has reached even the courts. But these indirect and vile ways are not the only ways, perhaps not the most truly effective ways, in which such power would work to the undoing of democracy. When we shall have substituted the new order for the old *régime* of competition and free individual initiative in all the great industries, when every one of them shall be organized into a single system under a single-headed control, and there shall be set above them all the money-lenders, the financiers, themselves brought into an equal solidarity, we will have gone far to deprive democracy of the very air which it must breathe to live. We will have denied to the mass of individuals the use and practice of self-dependence, self-direction, the wont and exercise and habit of freedom, without which they cannot fit themselves either to win it or preserve it.

Here, I repeat, is but the merest glance at the new conditions; the merest flirting aside of the curtain. But it may, I think, be sufficient to enable us to formulate the chief of the new issues. We are confronted, let us say, with the problem of adapting the democratic principle to conditions that did not exist when our American democracy arose in the world: that is to say, to a field no longer unlimited, to opportunities no longer boundless, and to an industrial order in which competition is no longer the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trolling principle, an industrial order which is, therefore, no longer democratic, but increasingly oligarchical, which may even become, in a way, monarchical, dynastic. To save itself politically, democracy must therefore become aggressively industrial; it must somehow extend itself into that field. Plainly, therefore, "*laissez-faire*" can no longer be its watchword. That was the watchword of the *régime* of competition. Democracy's task is twofold; it must secure for the State, the public, the people, some kind of effective, ultimate control over the natural sources of all wealth; and it must also secure, in an industrial system no longer controlled by competition, protection and opportunity for the individual.

That twofold task and battle will not be easy. Democracy, in fact, has never faced a harder, a more complicated struggle. Ere she come through it victorious, she will have need to call upon the names of all her saints, to hearten herself with the memories of the deeds of all her heroes. For privilege, driven from the Church, hurled from the throne, has here in America made her seat and stronghold in the market-place, and fortified it with such a skill and energy as were never before spent in her service. We may hope that if it be taken it will prove her last. But we cannot feel that it will be easily taken; we cannot even hope to take it by the methods of our past fighting against oppression.

That ancient warfare must, in fact, be begun all over again, and with new tactics, new strategy. In the presence of the overshadowing new issue, many of the old issues will be altered, reshaped. The old struggle over the tariff will be less and less a mere matter of conflicting sectional issues, less and less a matter of contrary economic theories, more and more a part and phase of the great struggle between democracy and privilege in industry. The old constitutional questions, many of which we have fondly thought forever settled, will reappear in new forms, and many new ones will also arise. Instead of being at the end of the period of great constitutional controversies, we are at the beginning of a new set of such controversies, deeper and more difficult than any that have come before. The rights and powers both of the States and the nation must be scrutinized afresh. We shall be lucky, indeed, if we can stop with mere constitutional decisions and adaptations and changes. Before the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

end, we may well have to go back farther still, and find for the common law itself, if not new principles, at any rate, new formulas. For I doubt if we shall end before we have revised many of what we have thought our fundamental conceptions of property and of human rights.

I doubt, indeed, if Democracy alone is in danger, if Democracy alone is the sole matter of the argument, the true stake of the contest. They that enlist in the new war, though they begin as defenders of Democracy only, may find before the end that they are in truth fighting in a still holier cause and can take their inspiration from a still greater name. Liberty, to save herself and all her immemorial winnings, must come herself into the field. And she cannot come as when, in the past, she has come to lift up peoples abased by kingly or aristocratic oppression or crushed by armies or yoked with the yoke of priestly bigotry. Coming now to lift up a people bowed down before the face of wealth, she must take on a new aspect, cry new invocations, learn new ways of warfare. She must get new weapons and a new armor. It may even be that she must wear a new face and form, and find for herself some other beauty than that with which, for so many ages, she has won to her hard service the noblest of mankind.

WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TWO PRAGMATISMS.*

BY VERNON LEE.

". . . The first part of the essay, however, is occupied with showing that, if Truth consists in satisfaction, it cannot be any *actual* satisfaction, but must be the satisfaction which *would* ultimately be found if the inquiry were pushed to its ultimate and indefeasible issue. This, I beg to point out, is a very different position from that of Mr. Schiller and the pragmatists of to-day . . . Their avowedly undefinable position, if it be not capable of logical characterization, seems to me to be characterized by an angry hatred of strict logic, and even some disposition to rate any exact thought which interferes with their doctrines as all humbug. . . It seems to me a pity they should allow a philosophy so instinct with life to become infected with seeds of death in such notions as that of the unreality of all ideas of infinity and that of the mutability of truth, and in such confusions of thought as that of active willing (willing to control thought, to doubt, and to weigh reasons) with willing not to exert the will (willing to believe)."*

In the following pages I shall try, in vulgar parlance, to show up what is nowadays being rather pressed upon our acceptance than offered for our inspection, under the ambiguous name of "Pragmatism." I would therefore premise that I am by no means attacking all the ideas connected with the doctrine so called, nor even the bulk thereof. The peculiarity of Pragmatism is (as I hope to demonstrate) its tactics of advancing untenable propositions and falling back upon received ones; its shuffling the principle which is hard to accept in a handful of principles we have willingly accepted; its medium-like device (for only successive metaphors can illustrate habits so Protean) of slipping a hand out of the seemingly unbroken circle of concatenated thought, in order to produce all manner of new and desirable

* Charles S. Peirce, "Hibbert Journal," Vol II, No. 1 (Oct., 1908), pages 111, 112.

* All rights reserved by the author. Copyright in the U S. A.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manifestations. And, for this reason, two-thirds of all that Pragmatists adduce is not only a re-statement —sometimes a really improved and enlarged re-statement—of their opponents' views, but embodies, most admirably stated, the very arguments those opponents have used against them. Indeed, as we shall see, the name of Pragmatism is now taken by a doctrine which the inventor of that name, the much-quoted and little-read Charles Sanders Peirce, forestalled only to denounce and demolish it.

The result of all this is that I wish to premise that I am attacking, not certain books, with two-thirds of whose contents I concur; still less certain writers from whose analytic talent (in the case of Mr. F. C. Schiller), from whose wide-sweeping genius (in the case of Professor W. James) I have derived so much advantage; least of all, the whole mass of doctrine labelled Pragmatism. I am attacking the views which put Pragmatism and Pragmatists in opposition to every other existing or conceivable philosophy. Or, rather, I am attacking a particular temperament which, imported into philosophy from wholly different fields of thought, tests truth by the standards of worldly practicality, of moral edification, and of religious sentiment, and thereby passes off as *true* what may be merely useful or inspiriting delusions, merely practically serviceable, emotionally satisfying, or morally commendable, figments.

For, at the bottom of this kind of Pragmatism, which the more illustrious of its two promoters has associated with the expression "Will-to-believe"*—at the bottom of Will-to-believe Pragmatism

* Professor James seems anxious to withdraw the expression "will-to-believe"—telling us ("Pragmatism," page 258) that he "unluckily" gave that name to an essay of which the critics (presumably the present writer in a "Fortnightly" article, reprinted in "Gospels of Anarchy") neglected the meaning in order to "pounce down on the title." Professor James, in the same place, now defines the subject of that essay as the "Right-to-Believe." "Right to believe," in plain English, usually means the existence of an intellectual alternative, *i. e.*: "In the face of So-and-so's evidence, I have the right to believe that what happened was this." Or else the absence of coercion by the State: "in this country, people have the right to believe as they choose": *i. e.*, differences of opinion are tolerated by the laws and customs. What Professor James argued for in that "Will-to-Believe" essay was the expediency, the occasional personal or moral advantage (exemplified by the courage of men who *believe* they can resist brigands, and the difference in our conduct due to religious belief) of accepting a hypothesis on other than intellectual grounds. Of these he wrote ("Will to Believe" page 9): "It is only our dead hypotheses that our willing nature is unable to bring to life again. . . . When I say 'willing nature,' I do not mean only such deliberate volitions as may have set up habits of belief that we cannot

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there exist the psychological recognition of the inevitable presence, and the moralist's recognition of the occasional utility, of ideas, of opinions, of beliefs, which have not passed muster as *true;* the recognition that conduct is frequently based, and can sometimes be based with advantage, on what has not yet been tested as true, on what has not stood the test of truth, or what it is only wished should be true: viz., hypotheses, assumptions, misconceptions, misstatements, ambiguities, delusions and deceptions, a large proportion of which appears inevitable and perhaps indispensable in the life of the individual and of the race. The recognition and partial rehabilitation of this particular *not-true* element would show the superior acumen and superior sincerity of modern psychology and of modern ethics. Indeed, the progress of mental science and of utilitarian morals might culminate in some bolder Nietzsche proclaiming that truth is by no means the one thing requisite; that life has been rendered liveable, and morality itself floated and ballasted only by a fortunate output of figment.

But the "Will-to-Believe" Pragmatists are not bolder than Nietzsche. They are, on the contrary (as persons concerned with practicality should be), most remarkably attached to consequences, to workable systems and moral edification, and, for the benefit of these, they are most conspicuously careful of not coming into open collision with established prejudices. Now, while *truth* is by no means always necessary for advantageous and commendable practice, *untruth* or *non-truth* (under any of its varieties and synonyms furnished forth by the invaluable Roget) happens to be hampered by a tiresome and paradoxical peculiarity: its utility, nine times out of ten, depends upon hiding its own status and keeping up the credit of truth. A hope is not a hope, a fear is not a fear, once either is recognized as unfounded. An ambiguity is acceptable only if it is accepted in one of its ambiguous meanings. A delusion is delusive only so long as it is not known to be

now escape from. I mean all such factors of belief as fear and hope, prejudice and passion, imitation and partisanship, the circumpressure of our caste and set." This "willing nature" is, presumably, what Professor James referred to in his title "Will-to-Believe." And as the only change made in his subsequent books is the addition of "truth" as well as "belief" being dependent on such action of our "willing nature," I consider it fair to continue to designate his particular kind of Pragmatism by that ex-title of his, "Will-to-Believe," which I always take in the sense of "willing nature" as defined in the above passage.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one. A mistake can be built upon only so long as it is not suspected; and that consoling, encouraging, sometimes salutary and edifying figment which Ibsen christened "Vital Lie" can be life-enhancing or life-saving only when it is mistaken for a "Vital Truth."

The psychologists and moralists who, under the name of Pragmatists, are teaching the unavoidable presence and the practical benefits of a Will-to-Believe, have therefore veiled in judicious silence the disconcerting, the dangerous, the immoral fact that error, delusion and deception, when born of human needs and purposes, are occasionally efficacious in directing human decisions, in regulating human conduct and in making human life possible. The Pragmatists have refused to proclaim the *value of what is possibly not true,* and they have applied themselves to identifying *that which possesses value* with *truth* itself. This they have done by laying hold of a philosophical principle to which its earliest formulator, Mr. Charles Sanders Peirce, had given the name of "Pragmatism"; and by converting this principle, by endless moves revoked whenever detected, into the very thing which that proto-Pragmatist had invented Pragmatism to expose, disprove, confute and reduce forever to silence.

Let us follow this process, and in so doing obtain, not merely a knowledge of the chief peculiarities of Will-to-Believe Pragmatism, but an insight also into the "Will-to-Believe," the Pragmatistic temper of mind and methods.

Professor James heralds his exposition of the pragmatic principle by telling us that, although only formulated by Mr. Peirce in the article entitled "How to Make Things Clear," it has been tacitly applied by the chief masters of British thought. He writes ("Varieties of Religious Experience," page 443):

> "The guiding principle of British philosophy has in fact been that every difference must *make* a difference, every theoretical difference issue in a practical difference, and [that] the best method of discussing points of theory is to begin by ascertaining what practical difference would result from one alternative or the other being true. What is the particular truth in question known as? In what facts does it result? What is its cash-value in terms of particular experience? This is the characteristic English way of talking up a question. In this way, you remember, Locke talks up the question of personal identity: 'What you mean by it is just your chain of particular memories,' says he. *That is the only verifiable part of its significance.* All further ideas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about it, such as the oneness or the manyness of the spiritual substance on which it is based are, therefore, void of intelligible meaning, and propositions touching such ideas may be indifferently affirmed or denied. So Berkeley with his 'Matter.' The cash-value of matter is our physical sensations. That *is what it is known as*, all that we concretely verify of its conception. That, therefore, is the whole meaning of the term 'Matter'; any other pretended meaning is mere wind of words. Hume does the same thing with Causation. It is known as habitual antecedence, and as tending on our part to look for something definite to come. Apart from this *practical meaning* it has no significance whatever and books about it may be committed to the flames, says Hume."

Throughout this quotation we are shown the pragmatic method applied to ascertain the contents of a thought as a preliminary to testing that thought's truth. Professor James represents Locke and Berkeley and Hume as refusing to discuss severally Human Identity, Matter and Causation, except in so far as each of these words can be translated into terms of experience. Pragmatism is being employed, as the title of Mr. Peirce's famous article has it, "to make our ideas clear." The expression "practical difference" means in this connection *difference in the facts, in the experience, implied in the definition:* so when we say that the concept "match," implying the property of igniting, *cæteris paribus,* on friction with a specified surface, we verify whether a certain object is a match by rubbing it, *cæteris paribus,* against such a surface and watching whether it does or does not ignite. "Practical difference" refers to our real or imagined experiment, and the "cash-value in terms of experience" means the translation of an abstract statement into such inferred results as will by their happening or not happening declare whether that abstract statement is in the particular relation to objective reality which we designate as *truth.* The pragmatic method, as Professor James represents it as practised by these philosophical worthies, is based upon the recognition that the idea of a thing implies *qualities in the thing,* and that the *qualities of a thing* are a convenient name given to our prevision of *how that thing will, under specified circumstances, act.* The *practical difference* referred to is a difference in the mode of proceeding *of the thing discussed;* whether or not there ensues a *practical difference* in the action of ourselves or other folk, in the action of any except that *particular discussed thing,* is a totally separate question. The "Pragmatic Principle," as exemplified in Professor James's account of its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

application by Locke, Berkeley and Hume, is, therefore, neither more nor less than the formula of scientific thinking, in contradistinction to such discussion of mere meaningless words as has been not unfairly reproached to "metaphysics." Thus understood, the "Pragmatic Principle" of Mr. Peirce, the formula of "cash-value in experience," would, no doubt, have interested the philosophers already mentioned, and those others, particularly the Mills and Bain, whom Professor James enumerates as having been pragmatical without knowing it. It would have interested also that most suggestive and genial man of science, the writer of William James's great "Psychology" and of so many invaluable *obiter dicta* even in the works intended to convert us to the Will-to-Believe. But when it comes to that particular Professor William James who has distinguished himself by the invention of the "Will-to-Believe," there seems no reason for his feeling particularly attracted, but rather (as we shall see later on) for his being particularly alienated, by the "Pragmatic Principle" and the "Cash-value in terms of experience" when interpreted in the above manner. For, the Pragmatic Principle and, more particularly, its Cash-value formulation are open also to another interpretation.

"Practical difference" may also be taken as meaning difference in the actions or habits of human beings, difference such as concerns practical persons in contradistinction to thinkers and investigators—for instance, educators and legislators, bent upon directly furthering prosperity and good behavior. Or, in other words, "practical difference" may be taken in the sense of implying such practice as is no longer the *test* of an opinion, but the *application* of an opinion once accepted, whether previously tested or not. The two meanings of "Practical Difference" are very near together, indeed in continual intercommunication, since everybody must admit that "practical difference," implying safe and desirable decisions about conduct, often follows upon the recognition of such "practical difference" between ideas as we have previously spoken of; nay, that though some of our *practical differences in conduct* happen to be due to our *not* knowing the *practical differences between what is and what is not true,* as when (so Professor James often urges) we *wager,* we *take risks* in which the gain is great and the loss trifling; yet the majority of our *practical* decisions are undoubtedly founded upon ourselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or some one else having "made ideas clear" and tested suppositions by actual or supposed experiment. Indeed, the two meanings of "practical difference" are in such close proximity that the thought of even "the maker clear of our ideas," of even Mr. Peirce himself, has occasionally wavered between the two.

Since, in that very article "How to Make Our Ideas Clear," we come upon the following ambiguous developments of that ambiguous expression "practical":

"To develop its meaning we have . . . simply to determine: what habits it produces; for what a thing means simply is simply what habits it involves" (page 292).

"What then is belief? . . . it involves the establishment in our nature of a rule of action, or, say, for short, *a habit*" (page 291).

"The essence of belief is the establishment of a habit, and different beliefs are distinguished by the different modes of action to which they give rise" (page 291).

"There is no distinction of meaning so fine as to consist in anything but a possible difference of practice" (page 293).

It is this ambiguity in Mr. Peirce's words, if not in his thought, which probably commended the "Pragmatic Principle" to Professor James.

It is the object of the following pages,* not to discuss the intrinsic merits of the "Pragmatic Principle," but to expose the "development or transmogrification" of the Pragmatism of

* This article had been already begun when Mr. Peirce published the following passage in an article in the "Hibbert Journal," (Oct., 1908):

"In 1871, in a Metaphysical Club in Cambridge, Massachusetts, I used to preach this principle as a sort of logical gospel, representing the unformulated method followed by Berkeley, and in conversation about it I called it 'Pragmatism.' In December, 1877, and January, 1878, I set forth the doctrine in the 'Popular Science Monthly'; and the two parts of my essay were printed in French in the '*Revue Philosophique*,' vols. VI and VII. Of course, the doctrine attracted no particular attention, for, as I had remarked in my opening sentence, very few people care for logic. But in 1897 Professor James remodelled the matter, and transmogrified it into a doctrine of philosophy, some parts of which I highly approved, while other and more prominent parts I regarded, and still regard, as opposed to sound logic. About the time Professor Papirie discovered, to the delight of the Pragmatist school, that this doctrine was incapable of definition, which would certainly seem to distinguish it from every other doctrine in whatever branch of science, I was coming to the conclusion that my poor little maxim should be called by another name; and accordingly, in April, 1905, I renamed it 'Pragmaticism.' I had never before dignified it by any name in print, except that, at Professor Baldwin's request, I wrote a definition of it for his 'Dictionary of Psychology and Philosophy.' I did not insert the word in the 'Century Dictionary,' though I had charge of the philosophical definitions of that work; for I have a perhaps exaggerated dislike of *réclame*."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"How to Make Our Ideas Clear" into the Pragmatism of the Will-to-Believe and of the Making of Truth. And, while doing this, we shall incidentally afford the reader an example of the application of the Pragmatic method itself. Like Locke asking the meaning of "Human Identity," like Berkeley asking the meaning of "Matter," like Hume asking the meaning of "Causation," we humble people will, in our turn, ask the meaning of "Practical Difference," and test it by examining whether the attitude toward *opinion and truth* taken up by Mr. Peirce is the same attitude as that taken up toward *opinion and truth* by Professor James and Mr. Schiller, or whether the difference in the resulting attitude does not prove a corresponding difference between the "Pragmatic Principle" as intended by Mr. Peirce, and the "Pragmatic Principle" as employed by Mr. Peirce's ostensible disciples:

"Consider what effects, which might conceivably have practical bearings, we conceive the object of our conception to have. Then *our conception of these effects* [italics mine] *is the whole of our conception of the object.*" "A figment is the product of somebody's imagination; it has such characters as his thought impresses upon it (A). That whose characters are *independent of how you or I think* [italics mine] is an external reality." (A) "Thus we may define the real as that whose characters are *independent of what anybody may think them to be.*" (B) "These minds do not seem to believe that disputation is ever to cease; they seem to think that *the opinion which is natural for one man is not so for another*, and that belief will consequently never be settled. In contenting themselves with fixing their own opinion by a method which would lead another man to a different result, (A) *they betray their feeble hold of the conception of what truth is.* On the other hand, all the followers of science are fully persuaded that the processes of investigation, *if only pushed far enough, will give one certain solution to every question* to which they can be applied. . . . *Different minds may set out with the most antagonistic views,* but the progress of investigation carries them *by a force outside* of themselves to one and the same conclusion. (A) This *activity of thought by which we are carried, not where we wish, but to a fore-ordained goal, is like the operation of destiny.* No modification of the point of view taken, no selection of other facts for study, no natural bent of mind, can enable a man to escape the predestinate opinion. This great law is embodied in the conception of truth and reality.

(A) "The opinion which is fated to be *ultimately agreed to by all who investigate* is *what is meant by truth,* and the object represented in this opinion is the real. (A) That is the way I would explain reality." "But it may be said that this view is opposed to the abstract

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

definition which I have given of reality, inasmuch as it makes the character of the real to depend on what is ultimately thought about them. But the answer to this is that, on the other hand, reality is independent, not necessarily of thought in general, but only of what you or I or any finite number of men may think about it; and that, on the other hand, though the object of the final opinion depends on what that opinion is, yet (B) *what that opinion is* does not depend on what you or I or any man thinks." (C) "Our perversity and that of others may indefinitely postpone the settlement of opinion; it might even conceivably cause an arbitrary proposition to be universally accepted as long as the human race should last. Yet even that would not change the nature of the belief which could alone be the result of investigation carried sufficiently far; and if, after the extinction of our race, another should arise with faculties and dispositions for investigation, that true opinion must be the one which they would ultimately come to. Truth crushed to earth shall rise again, and *the opinion which would finally result from investigation does not depend on how anybody may actually think*" [italics mine]. "A person who arbitrarily chooses the proposition he will adopt can use the word 'truth' only to emphasize the expression of his determination to hold to his choice."*

These quotations from "How to Make Our Ideas Clear" (to which might be added others from the essays constituting the first and third instalments of the series "Illustrations of the Logic of Science") display Mr. Peirce's attitude of mind regarding the relations of "truth" with what Professor James calls our "willing nature"—and which it is convenient to call by his essay title "Will-to-Believe." The following quotations display the attitude on this subject of the two chief philosophers who have accepted Mr. Peirce's principle and name of Pragmatism. I letter both sets of quotations, in order to facilitate the comparison between them.

Schiller: "Studies in Humanism," page 18:

(B) "Two men, therefore, with different fortunes, histories and temperaments, *ought not* to arrive at the same metaphysic . . . each should react *individually* on the food for thought which his *personal life* affords, and the resulting differences *ought not* to be set aside as void of ultimate significance." (Italics in the original.)

Schiller: "Axioms as Postulates—Personal Idealism," page 59:

(A) "What we have seen to be untrue, viz.: that there is an objective world given independently of us and constraining us to recognize it."

* C. S. Peirce, "Illustration of the Logic of Science: II. How to Make Our Ideas Clear" ("Popular Science Monthly," New York, Appleton & Co., No. LXIX, January, 1878, pages 286 to 302).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Schiller: "Studies in Humanism," page 189:

(A) "He (the Pragmatist) thinks that the coerciveness of 'fact' has been enormously exaggerated by failure to observe that it is never sheer coercion but always mitigated by his acceptance."

Schiller: "Studies in Humanism," page 208:

(A) (Pragmatic truth) "is fluid, not rigid, temporal and temporary, not eternal and everlasting; *chosen, not inevitable;* born of passion and sprung (like Aphrodite) from a foaming sea of desires, not 'dispassionate' nor 'purely intellectual'; incomplete, not perfect; fallible, not inerrant; absorbed in the attaining of what is not yet achieved; purposive and struggling towards ends."

Schiller: "Axioms as Postulates—Personal Idealism," page 120:

(B) "What are these mechanical explanations which have so successfully occupied the fertile field of science? They are devices of our own . . . ideals conceived by our intelligence to which we are coaxing reality to approximate."

Schiller: "Studies in Humanism," page 12:

(C) ". . . The human reason is ever gloriously human . . . it mercifully interposes an impenetrable veil between us and any truth or reality *which is wholly alien to our nature.*"

William James: "Pragmatism," page 273:

(B) "On pragmatic principles we cannot reject any hypothesis if consequences useful to life flow from it. Universal conceptions . . . have indeed no meaning and no reality if they have no use. But if they have any use, they have that amount of meaning, and the meaning will be true if the use squares well with life's other uses."

William James: "Pragmatism," page 76:

(B) "But in this world . . . certain ideas are not only agreeable to think about, or agreeable as supporting other ideas that we are fond of, but they are also helpful in life's practical struggles. If there be any life that it is really better we should lead, and if there be any idea which, believed in, would help us to lead that life, then it would be really *better for us* [italics *sic*] *to believe in that idea, unless, indeed, belief in it incidentally clashed with other, greater vital benefits.* (Italics *sic.*)

(B) "What would be better for us to believe! This sounds *very like a definition of truth.* [Italics mine.] It comes very near to saying what we *ought* [italics *sic*] to believe! And in *that* definition none of you would find any oddity. Ought we ever not to believe what it is *better for us* to believe? And can we then keep the notion of what is better

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for us and what is *true for us* [italics mine] permanently apart? Pragmatism says no, and I fully agree with her!"

William James: "Pragmatism," page 204:

(A) "You can say of it either that: it is useful because it is true; or that it is true because it is useful. *True* is the name for whatever starts the verification process;* useful is the name for its completed function in experience."

William James: "Pragmatism," page 73:

(B) "If theological ideas prove to have a value for concrete life, they will be true, for pragmatism, in the sense that they are good for so much."

William James: "Pragmatism," page 299:

(A) "On pragmatic principles, if the hypothesis of God works satisfactorily in the widest sense of the word, it is true."

(B) "Now, whatever its residual difficulties may be, experience shows that it certainly does work and that the problem is . . . to determine it so that it will combine with all the other working truths."

William James: "Pragmatism," page 200:

(B) "Pragmatism asks its usual question: Grant an idea or a belief to be true, it says, what concrete difference will its being true make in any one's actual life?"

Schiller: "Humanism," page 260 *et seq.*:

(B) "In the end the world is human experience, and a world which we neither did nor could experience would not be one we need argue or trouble about.

"What would be our attitude towards the world in which the ultimate significance of our ideals was denied . . . and in which the hope of happiness was nothing but a delusion?"

Schiller: "Humanism," page 199 *et seq.*:

(B) "Knowledge is power, because we decline to recognize as knowledge whatever does not satisfy our lust for power."

"It follows that ultimate reality must be absolutely satisfactory."

(A) "There is a serious fallacy in the notion that the pursuit of truth could reveal a chamber of horrors in the innermost shrine. . . .

* C. S. Peirce: "How to Make Our Ideas Clear," page 289: ". . . the action of thought is excited by the irritation of doubt, and ceases when belief is attained; so that production of belief is the sole function of thought." This shows that for Peirce *doubt* "is the name of what starts the verification process"—*truth* what ends that process when it has been properly carried through. Note Professor James's implying that *we know truth* before embarking on the process of ascertaining it!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(B) "If this were true we should decline to believe it and to accept it as true. And even if we could be forced to the admission that the pursuit of truth necessarily and inevitably brought us face to face with some unbearable atrocity . . . [C] as soon as the pursuit of truth was generally recognized to be practically noxious, we should simply give it up."

(C) "If its misguided votaries persisted in their diabolical pursuit of truth regardless of the consequences, they would be stamped out as the Indian Government has stamped out the Thugs. . . . The thing has happened over and over again. All through the Middle Ages most branches of knowledge were under black suspicion as hostile to human welfare. They languished accordingly."

Schiller: "Axioms as Postulates—Personal Idealism," page 122:

(B) "There is no intelligibility without conformity to human nature, and human nature is teleological . . . A world which can be 'fully explained' but only in mechanical or barely intellectual terms, is *not* fully intelligible, is *not* fully explained.

"An intelligent reader may perhaps gather . . . why the personality of God should be esteemed an indispensable postulate. Is immortality a postulate? At present we are too profoundly ignorant as to what men actually desire in the matter, and why and how to decide what they ought to desire."

William James: "Pragmatism," concluding sentence:

(B) "Between the two extremes, of crude naturalism on the one hand and transcendental absolutism on the other, you may find that what I take the liberty of calling the pragmatistic or melioristic type of theism, is exactly *what you require.*"

Such, then, is the attitude towards Truth and the Will-to-Believe of Mr. C. S. Peirce, and such the attitude of Messrs. James and Schiller. Applying in this case that selfsame method for "making our ideas clear" which bids us test the meaning of an idea by the results of that possible meaning, we see that the Pragmatic Principle involved by Messrs. James and Schiller must differ from the Pragmatic Principle formulated by Mr. Peirce, inasmuch as the consequences not only deducible but actually deduced from the one, are in flagrant contradiction with the consequences deduced from the other. The contradiction amounts to this, that while Mr. Peirce makes *truth* into an intellectual imperative which sooner or later imposes itself (or would impose itself but for human "perversity") on *opinion,* Messrs. James and Schiller (besides constantly confusing "Truth" with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its objective co-relate "Reality") calmly identify *truth* with *belief*, and *belief* with *opinion*, and they test *truth* (which is itself belief's and opinion's standard) by the beneficial or agreeable, the useful consequences due to holding a given belief or opinion. The contradiction between the two attitudes toward truth can be *practically* tested by substituting the word "opinion" for the word "truth" in the quotations severally from Mr. Peirce and from his self-styled disciples. In the quotations from Mr. Peirce, this substitution results in nonsense: no one could mean that "opinion" [in original "truth"] "is that whose characters are independent of what anybody may think them to be," nor that "opinion" ["truth"] "is the fore-ordained conclusion of scientific investigation if pushed far enough"; nor that "opinion" ["truth"] "is produced by a force outside of ourselves and similar to destiny"; still less that "opinion" ["truth"] "crushed to earth shall rise again independent of what any one thinks," even if it have to await the coming of another race of human beings; least of all, that we may expect unanimity of "opinion" ["truth"] from individuals starting with different bias, character and methods. It is obvious, therefore, that, when Mr. Peirce speaks of *truth*, he does not mean the same thing as *opinion*.

But, if we perform this little experiment upon the quotations from Messrs James and Schiller, we shall find ourselves in front of a totally different "practical result."

So far from turning the sentences into nonsense, the substitution of "opinion" for "truth" will make them not only clear and reasonable, but frequently truistic and platitudinous: two individuals may, indeed, be expected to arrive at *opinions* as different as their lives and fortunes. Acceptance of an opinion is certainly different from coercion by fact. *Opinion* may, indeed, be "chosen, not inevitable" "temporary, not eternal"; "fluid, not rigid"; "passionate," not unbiassed; nor could anything be more appropriate than Mr. Schiller's simile of *opinion* rising, like Aphrodite, "out of a foaming sea of desire." We can all think of cases when human reason's "glorious humanness" has interposed a veil, merciful or otherwise, between mankind and *opinions* "alien to its nature"; and history does show (as Mr. Peirce remarks in the first of his articles on the "Logic of Science") no end of violent repressions of *opinions* which were deemed danger-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous or odious. Professor James would be not less logical, but a deal more so, if he said that it is *opinion* which "starts the verification-process"; more logical, because that verification-process results in a *truth* which sometimes dispels an *opinion.* People much less subtle than Mr. Schiller have talked of "*making* up their minds," or "making themselves an *opinion*"; and no one, subtle or not, would deny that many *opinions* are *purposive.* And, finally, this very fluid, temporal, temporary, individual, biassed, passionate, human-made (even officially made) thing, *opinion,* can be arranged, tested, accepted, welcomed, scouted anathematized, on the score of being or not being useful, beneficent, conducive to life. For instance, basing ourselves on Lafcadio Hearn, we might quite admit that the *opinions* summed up under the title "Ancestor-Worship" had been (to quote Professor James's rather commercial phrase of recommendation) "exactly what was required" by the former inhabitants of Japan; but few of us would be ready to describe those "Ancestor-worship" opinions as "independent of what any one thought," and "foreordained to be ultimately arrived at by investigators despite all individual and temporary bias," as Mr. Peirce describes *truth.* For, so far from *opinion* being identifiable with *truth,* it frequently happens that an *opinion* may be extremely efficacious, practically and morally, and yet, on the contrary, *false.*

Now, it is exactly because *opinion,* while possessing all the characteristics attributed by Messrs. James and Schiller to *truth,* by no means always answers to Mr. Peirce's definition of *truth,* that we must set our face against the identification, even against the partial confusion of *opinion* with *truth:* the two words must be kept separate because they answer to separate, to occasionally overlapping but by no means equivalent, notions. And the tendencies leading to this identification of truth and opinion, leading to this testing truth by practical, moral, extrinsic value, are tendencies requiring to be checked, not because they exist in distinguished thinkers like Messrs. James and Schiller, but because they exist in all of us, and are such that all philosophy is not too much to keep them in order.

The "Will-to-Believe," the "consent of our willing nature," the "purposive making of truth" are labels for human instincts as universal as the instincts bidding us seek pleasure, repose and advantage wherever they can be got, and without consideration

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the pleasure, the repose, the advantage of other beings. Most of our thoughts, and probably the whole of our faculty for thinking, have arisen at the bidding of an interested purpose of a self-seeking will; and this accounts for many of the absurdities that have been thought, and perhaps for most of the vices of our methods of thinking. But, thanks to the pressure of universal and averaged purposes and interests upon individuals, thanks to the conflict of *opinions,* of *purposively made truths* and of *beliefs which are willed,* there has been evolved in our thinking nature a check, a counteracting force, to those interested motives and emotional preferences without which there would have been no thinking faculty at all. That check is the particular thing defined by Mr. Peirce as *truth.* That counteracting force is constituted by the taste, the passion, the instinctive and imperious respect for truth, which plays in our intellectual life the part played in our individual and social life by the instincts of justice and chastity. In the same way that our life as human beings would be laid waste without these other two great altruistic instincts, so also, were it not for the passion for truth, our intellectual life would have been perpetually jeopardized by the natural tendency to believe (or pretend to believe) whatsoever appeals to individual or momentary interests and preferences. Mankind has always wanted, perhaps always required, and certainly always made itself, a stock of delusions and sophisms, of *vital lies* or of *white lies.* Every human being's thought, consciously or unconsciously, tends to accommodate itself to some wish, some use, some habit. Every opinion tends to identify itself with truth. The *Will-to-Believe,* the purposive making of truth, are unceasingly at work. This is the reason why we have no use for the kind of Pragmatism which teaches the testing of truth by its utility, the identification of truth with opinion, which preaches this universal and ineradicable vice of all thinking on a self-assertive virtue.

VERNON LEE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

BY JOHN WILLIAM PERRIN.

THE first forms of socialism in the nineteenth century were the offspring of two great revolutions that occurred in the eighteenth. That of Robert Owen came from the industrial revolution in England that followed the inventions of Watt, Crompton, Hargreaves and Arkwright revolutionizing the manufacture of textile fabrics. That of St.-Simon was the result of the revolution in the world of thought that occurred mainly in France through the influence of Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau and the Encyclopædists. Neither of these was revolutionary in the ordinary sense; both were non-political. The aim of Owen was to complete the industrial revolution; that of St.-Simon was little, if anything, more than to further the work begun by the French Philosophers.

These types of socialism perished in the Revolution of 1848; and that which has succeeded them is both political and revolutionary. Its chief homes are no longer in England and France, but in Germany and Russia. The form that has grown to greatest numerical proportions is the German Social Democracy whose creed is the legitimate offspring of the democratic communism of the young Hegelians. It assumes the rôle of its anarchistic prototype in the first French Revolution and seeks the overthrow of all existing order that it may establish the social democratic state.

There is division among the Social Democrats as to the form of government to be set up in the Social State. Some favor a strong central government; but others exclude entirely the idea of a federation from their ideal, and adhere to the doctrine of Proudhon that "government of man by man, in every form, is oppression." They believe that "each man should be a law to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself" and all supreme government abolished. While there is division on the question of government, the party is one in the belief that the new social order can come only by the subversion of all existing institutions. Therefore, it attacks the State, derides patriotism, opposes religion, seeks the destruction of the family and endeavors to set up communism in the whole life of the people. August Bebel, its most representative leader, has said: "In politics we are republicans, in economics socialists, in religion atheists." This is the gospel of chaos preached so successfully as to create the largest political party in the empire.

Socialism had little foothold in Germany before 1848. Six years earlier Professor Lorenzo von Stein had expressed the opinion that "Germany need not fear socialism, for unlike France and England she has no proletariat to speak of." But even then powerful influences were at work stimulating its development. There was already a socialistic philosophy derived chiefly from Hegel, but coming in part from Fichte. A reaction, too, had set in against the old political economy derived from the school of Adam Smith in England in the days when Hardenberg and Heinrich von Stein were attempting the economic upbuilding of the country after its conquest by Napoleon; and a few able propagandists, among them Karl Marx, had begun to preach the need of a new social order. When the revolution of 1848 came, the spirit of democracy and revolution that had been inherited from the first French Revolution was revived and intensified. The soil was now ready for the new seed, and when it was planted it grew to marvellous and alarming proportions.

In the first year after the revolution little was accomplished. True, Schulze-Delitzsh founded a number of co-operative societies, but his work, like that of Owen and St.-Simon, was non-political. What Schulze sought was the establishment of "reforms social rather than socialistic." His motto was "Self-Help," and his followers were artisans and small tradesmen who were willing to help themselves when once shown the way. By 1860 the co-operative associations had a membership of two hundred thousand, and in this year the different associations transacted a total of thirty million dollars of business and contributed almost a third as much as capital. The influence of Schulze was now at zenith, but immediately it began to wane. Two years earlier, in a congress of German economists at Gotha, he had allied him-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self with the capitalistic party. This estranged many of his followers, who turned to Lassalle, the opponent of the individualism advocated by Schulze.

The possibility of making socialism a working revolutionary force came only with the radicalism of Ferdinand Lassalle. He was of wealthy Jewish parentage and was born in Breslau. A man of brilliant parts, he was educated at the Universities of Breslau and Berlin. Humboldt called him "*Das Wunderkind,*" and when his "*Das System der erworbenen Rechte*" appeared in 1861 Savigny said it was "the ablest legal book since the sixteenth century." It was in 1862, the year following the accession of William I of Prussia, that he began his career of propagandism. On April 12th he gave a lecture before an Artisans' Association in Berlin, in which he, historically and philosophically, traced the development of society and the State. His argument was able and trenchant, and the day it was given has been called the birthday of German socialism.

Lassalle contended that the Revolution of 1848 had freed the fourth estate as the first French Revolution had freed the third. He urged workmen to organize for industrial freedom, and insisted that their only chance to improve their conditions in life was in productive associations that would give them the entire benefit of their labor. He claimed, too, that it was "the duty of the State to furnish these associations with capital, to insure justice to all members and to regulate the markets of the world." He defeated Schulze-Delitzsh before the workmen's unions at Leipsic and Frankfort and then organized the "Universal German Working-man's Association," destined to grow into the Social Democratic party.

Lassalle died August 31st, 1864, from the effects of a wound received in a duel. Bernhard Becker, his successor, was a failure, and for the next three years the "Universal Association" made very little progress. In 1867 Becker was succeeded by Jean Baptista von Schweitzer, a member of an old and wealthy family of Frankfort-on-the-Main. Von Schweitzer was a good administrator and believed fully in the doctrines of Lassalle, which he defended with ability and vigor. It was his aim, as Lassalle had intended, to guide the agitation along national lines; but in this he was thwarted by Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel. Liebknecht had professed to be a disciple of Lassalle: Bebel orig-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inally had accepted the doctrines of Schulze-Delitzsh. Both were now under the influence of the international socialism of Karl Marx, and all their energies were used to prevent the workmen's unions which had sprung up since 1860 from attaching themselves to the national socialism of Lassalle. It was not long before they had formed a party favorable to their cause. Then it was easy to make the transition from the radicalism of Lassalle to the international revolutionary socialism of Marx.

The workmen's unions had been federated in 1863. Five years later the federation rejected the scheme of Schulze-Delitzsh as entirely inadequate and declared for international socialism. A year earlier (1867) Liebknecht and Bebel had succeeded in persuading a large majority of the members of the Universal Association to accept the international programme; and in 1869 the "internationalized" union, with the seceding members of the Universal Association, met at Eisenach and formed the "Social Democratic Working-men's Party." The programme set forth as the object of the party the establishment of the Free People's State. It combated with great energy existing social and political conditions, and stated that "the struggle for the emancipation of the working-classes is not a struggle for class privileges and prerogatives, but for equal rights and equal duties, and for the abolition of all class supremacy." A little later a party organ was adopted and the work of winning converts was actively begun.

Little was accomplished during the next two years. The Franco-Prussian War prevented the party's making any decided gains. Indeed, "the wave of patriotic enthusiasm that swept over the land nearly submerged the socialistic agitation": but when peace came the propagation of social democratic doctrines went on under most favorable conditions. War had brought business inflation; this was increased greatly in the first years that followed peace by the expenditure of the enormous French indemnity, which to many seemed an inexhaustible source of wealth. There was the wildest speculation and in the end business depression. Wages fell. Men were thrown out of employment. These were ready now to accept any social vagary that promised them a better future.

There were other reasons, too, why the party grew rapidly between 1871 and 1878. In 1874 the peace footing of the army

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was fixed for seven years at 401,659 men. To support this vast armament the resources of the nation were being drained. In 1876 the imperial budget fixed the necessary expenses of the army at 252,099,350 marks; two years later this sum was exceeded by 97,797,473 marks. In 1875 Liebknecht's labors to bring the members of the Universal Association who had remained true to the principles of Lassalle since 1869 into the Social Democratic camp were crowned with success. In that year at Gotha the German Socialists were all united into one body.

The result of the business depression, increased taxation to support what was probably the costliest military system the world had ever seen, and the union of the socialist forces at Gotha is best seen in the election of 1877. In 1871 the party had cast 124,655 votes and returned but two members to the Reichstag. Now they elected twelve deputies and cast a popular vote of nearly a half-million. The situation was alarming, but repressive measures were not thought of until the logical outcome of socialism appeared in 1878 in two attempts to assassinate the aged Emperor. The first was by a youth of low character named Hödel, who boasted of his socialistic opinions. The second was by Dr. Karl Nobling. Hödel inflicted no injury upon the Emperor, but Nobling wounded him severely. Then the cry for repression came from all parts of the Empire. The Government introduced a bill to prohibit "the existence and formation of all organizations seeking to subvert the present State and society." The debate that followed is of historic interest. Bismarck prepared the way for an open avowal in favor of State socialism by frankly stating his economic and social beliefs. He declared that his hostility to Social Democracy had come from hearing "one of its leading members in an open sitting of the Reichstag express his sympathy for the Paris Commune." He alluded to the atheism prevalent among socialists and said that he would not care to live a day longer had he not what Schiller called "the belief in God and a better future." "Rob the poor of that, for which you cannot compensate them," he said, "and you prepare them for the weariness of life which shows itself in acts like those we have experienced." The Social Democrats were no less frank than Bismarck. Bebel declared that it was the wish of his party "to abolish the present form of private property in the instruments of production and means of labor as well as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in land." He twitted Bismarck for his association with socialists, and especially his friendship with Lassalle. He also mentioned Roscher, Rodbertus, Rau, Schäffle, Schmoller and others as political economists with socialistic leanings.

The bill became a law and a temporary success followed its rigid enforcement. In the election of 1881 the Social Democrats, while they still returned twelve deputies to the Reichstag, saw their popular vote sink from 493,288 in 1877 to 311,961. Now they began to work in secret. Socialist editors took advantage of the privileged nature of parliamentary reports and published in full the speeches made by Liebknecht, Bebel and other socialist deputies in the Reichstag. On two different occasions Bismarck attempted by vote to suppress the publicity of proceedings, but each time he was defeated.

In 1879 a secret conference was held at Währing. Here Johann Most, later the notorious anarchist of New York and Chicago, and Wilhelm Hasselmann, a native of Bremen, urged revolution outright. Later in the year it was voted by a congress held at Wynden, in Switzerland, to reject the revolutionary schemes of the anarchistic leaders and to adhere to the policy of "passive resistance" proposed by Liebknecht and Bebel; but the manifesto issued after the close of the congress contradicted this vote most flatly by declaring for the overthrow of the present "insane and criminal" State and social system. Even while the congress was voting its policy of "passive resistance," "The Social Democrat," the official organ of the party, was proclaiming the necessity of the subversion of all existing order to establish the social democratic State.

The assassination of Alexander II of Russia by Nihilists, March 13th, 1881, led Bismarck, on the urgent request of the Emperor, to lay before the European Powers the need of united action for the suppression of the forces of anarchy and destruction. Urged by Germany to take the initiative, Russia invited a conference of the Powers at Brussels. France conditioned her assent upon that of England. England declined the invitation and the conference was not held. All that came of Bismarck's efforts was the conclusion of an extradition and dynamite treaty between Germany and Russia.

About this time the Niederwald plot against the royal family was discovered. This aroused the authorities to greater vigilance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than ever. Numerous arrests were made, and at the trial in Leipsic, in December, 1884, two men were sentenced to death for participation in the plot. The Anti-Socialist law was prolonged till September, 1886, and greater police powers were given to local authorities. But these measures, rigorous as they were, failed to check the growth of the Social Democratic party, which now had considerable funds for the propagation of its principles from "The Social Democrat," whose circulation had greatly increased, though it was published out of Germany.

The result of the election of 1884 was very gratifying to the Social Democrats. They had made a vigorous campaign and demonstrated a strength that no one suspected. They gained 238,029 votes over what they polled in the election of 1881 and won twenty-four seats in the Reichstag. The Government now resolved upon a war of extermination, but, despite its vigorous efforts for suppression, the Social Democratic vote rose at the next general election in 1887 to 763,000. For a time now the situation was unchanged. This was due to the death of the old Emperor and the uncertainty as to the policy of his successors. In May, 1889, the most serious strike ever known in Germany occurred in the coal-mines of Westphalia and the Rhenish province. For a time it threatened to extend throughout the Empire, but in a few weeks it came to an end in a victory for the most part to the miners. The influence of this strike, the almost constant socialist trials and the agitation over the question of renewing the Anti-Socialist law added many recruits to the ranks of the Social Democrats. Bismarck's insistence that the law be prolonged led to differences between him and the young Emperor that resulted, in 1890, in his resignation as Chancellor. The law was not renewed and the exiled socialists swarmed back to Germany. Liebknecht became editor of the "*Volksblatt*" and the propagandists of the party became more active. In October of this year a congress was held at Halle. Here was reached the logical conclusion of the socialism enunciated at Eisenach when the party was formed. At Eisenach it was the democratic State that was still to the front when the union of the socialist forces occurred at Gotha, but at Halle the State had become a reactionary institution which it was right to destroy.

The election in 1890 proved the party to be the largest in the Empire. Its popular vote was nearly a million and a half and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its representation in the Reichstag had risen to thirty-five. Till now the party's vote had come from the cities and towns. This election gave conclusive evidence that considerable advance was being made in the country districts. Since 1890 the party has seen its most rapid growth. During the first half of the year 1893 the all-absorbing political question was the parliamentary struggle over the Army Bill. The Government introduced a bill to increase the peace footing nearly one hundred thousand men to make the army as strong numerically as that of France. The increased expense was estimated at sixty-nine million marks. The Social Democratic, National-Liberal and Radical parties united in opposition to the bill on the ground that present taxes were already unbearable and the people were not able to stand any increase. The Government was defeated and the Reichstag immediately dissolved. The new election was set for June 15th. The Social Democrats put all their energy into the campaign. They worked harder than any of the other parties and made greater gains in the popular vote. They succeeded in electing forty-four deputies, nine more than they had before the dissolution of the Reichstag.

In 1894 Prince Hohenlohe introduced an Anti-Revolutionary Bill; but this was defeated in the Reichstag, and then the Government, in its endeavors to check the growth of socialism, was compelled to employ rigorously such provisions in existing laws as it was believed would hamper the socialists. But this policy created more alarm in the Liberal party than in that which it was intended to repress. The legislative period for which this Reichstag was elected expired June 15th, 1898, and the new election took place June 16th. In the campaign that preceded the election the once powerful Liberal party played little part. It was now divided into many factions which were at war with one another. Chief interest centred in the propagandism of the highly organized Clerical and Social Democratic party. A letter of Graf Posadowsky of the Clerical party, urging that all parties of civil order unite in combating the Social Democracy, increased the energies and work of the leaders of the Social Democrats for victory. The letter was regarded as an expression of the views of the Government and seemed to "countenance agrarianism and higher protection by its references to aiding the producers by the settlement of difficult questions of international competition, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to promoting the prosperity of the classes whose interests were most endangered—agriculturists and the middle classes." The Social Democrats set up a candidate in each of the three hundred and ninety-seven districts. They elected fifty-six deputies and cast a total of 2,107,076 votes. Two years later Wilhelm Liebknecht, the leader of the party, died. Since then August Bebel has been in command. In the election of 1903 the party sent eighty-one deputies to the Reichstag and increased its popular vote 903,695 over that cast in 1898. In the last election, that of 1907, while there was a loss of thirty-eight deputies, the popular vote increased nearly a quarter of a million.

THE GROWTH OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY SINCE 1867.

	Popular Vote.	*Deputies.*
1871	124,655	2
1874	351,952	10
1877	493,288	13
1878	437,158	9
1881	311,961	13
1884	549,990	24
1887	763,128	11
1890	1,427,298	35
1893	1,786,738	44
1898	2,107,076	56
1903	3,010,771	81
1907	3,258,968	43

The fact that the party's representation in the Reichstag does not correspond proportionately with its popular vote prevents its being a very important factor in the enactment of legislation, except as it may by combination with other parties block proceedings. But even though it is not able to put its pernicious programme into the laws of the land, it must be regarded as a constant danger to social order. While its leader, Bebel, is a man of lower intellectual rank than Lassalle and Marx, he is nevertheless able, and is skilled in debate and the art of party management. The party is without doubt not only the largest but the most thoroughly organized and efficiently led revolutionary body that the world has ever seen. It is a constant menace, not only to Germany, but to the entire world. Its programme of democratic communism and the radical utterances of its leaders give ample justification to the remark made many years ago by the second Chancellor of the Empire that "it is the greatest danger which threatens the close of the nineteenth century and the opening of the twentieth."

JOHN WILLIAM PERRIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BARBEY D'AUREVILLY.

A FRENCH DISCIPLE OF WALTER SCOTT.

BY WILLIAM ASPENWALL BRADLEY.

How many, I wonder, of those who perused the list of books included in the famous "Pigskin Library," noted, with the little shock of surprise and pleasure felt always at the sight of a familiar friend in an unexpected place, the title of Barbey d'Aurevilly's "*Le Chevalier des Touches*"? One has, of course, no real right to be surprised at any revelation of the scope of the reading of the distinguished pigskin librarian. Doubtless he has read as well "*L'Ensorcelée*," "*La Vieille Maîtresse*" and all the rest of those extraordinary books, of whose author a French critic has said that, if Balzac had written one of them, "*Les Diaboliques*," it would be regarded as the greatest of his works. If he has done so, he has enjoyed as rare and heady a draught of romance as may be drawn from the wells of modern literature. For, as the same critic, M. Remy de Gourmont, says:

"Barbey d'Aurevilly is one of the most original figures of the nineteenth century. It is probable that he will long excite curiosity, that he will long remain one of those singular and, as it were, subterranean writers, who are the veritable life of French literature. Their altar is at the bottom of a crypt, but the faithful descend to it willingly, while the temple of the great saints opens to the sun its ennui and its void. . . . Barbey d'Aurevilly is not one of those men who impose themselves on the banal admiration. He is complex and capricious. Some hold him to be a Christian writer . . . others denounce his immorality and his diabolical audacity. There is all of that in him: whence arose contradictions that were not solely successive."

It is owing to this *malentendu* that even in France he is relatively little read, and only in a circle whose opinions are not shaped by ecclesiastical authority and the official criteria of the libraries which have tended silently to suppress him. For the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public at large he has remained principally a fantastic figure who believed in the Devil—perhaps worshipped him—and who not only wrote a book about Beau Brummel, but exemplified the philosophy of "dandysme" in his own person to the delight of the Boulevards.

It is thus that Anatole France has portrayed d'Aurevilly as a fanciful memory of his own childhood, while he himself was still viewing the world framed by the door of an old bookshop on the quays of the Seine; and it is probable that this half legendary evocation by one who has in a high degree the fatal faculty of fixing values, will survive the efforts of the friends of the critic and novelist—he died as recently as 1889, though he was born in 1808—to establish for him a definite and recognized place in the literature of the last century. Two years ago the centenary of his birth was celebrated by the unveiling of a memorial in Paris, and by the publication of a special edition of his "*Voyageurs et Romanciers*" which contains an echo of the most famous incident of his career as a critic. "*Il ne m'est guères permis, à moi, d'écrire le mot d'idiot,*" he remarks in the course of a review, and a foot-note explains the reference to the fact that, at the very moment, the walls of Paris were plastered with *affiches* bearing the legend: "Barbey d'Aurevilly, Idiot." Such was the anonymous response to his attack on Victor Hugo for the commercial methods employed in the exploitation of "*Les Misérables.*" "*Ma couronne murale,*" was Barbey's counter-retort to this *affichement.* He was a vehement critic who conceived his calling as a kind of crusade against all that was tawdry and vulgar in contemporary life. Wanting in dignity, detachment, and coherence, his figure as a quixotic crusader and champion of Christianity in an atheistic age, fits in well with the fantastic legend which has stood in the way of his serious acceptance. Few outside of those who, headed by M. Bourget, may be said to form his cult, have cared to dive below the troubled surface of a man the vices and vanities of whose mind seem sufficiently attested by the titles of his works. Huysmans set the final seal on his diabolism when he penned the highly colored analysis of "*Un Prêtre Marié*" in "*A Rebours.*" It was thus, as a diabolist, that Mr. Gosse, in the spirit of a showman rather than of a critic, interpreted him to English readers through the medium of a study generally misleading and often inaccurate in detail. Even the poet, Mr. Sturge

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moore, who, in a brilliant article in the "New Quarterly," showed true penetration in detecting the traits of moral pathos and dignity that mark the physiognomy of Baudelaire, thought he could do the author of "*Fleurs du Mal*" no better service than by dissociating him from the vulgar *farceur,* d'Aurevilly.

Now it seems to me that this is essentially unfair. At least there was enough in common between the two men to enable d'Aurevilly to acclaim Baudelaire as a poet, while the latter recognized the "cult of truth, expressed with a frightful ardor," in d'Aurevilly. The difference between them consisted principally in the fact that one belonged to the younger, the other to the elder generation. Both were romantics, but both found individual forms for their romantic expression. In a sense, however, d'Aurevilly was the forerunner of Baudelaire in that ideal of frigid impassivity and correctness of demeanor which one associates peculiarly with the latter. His first novel, "*L'Amour Impossible,*" was a study in aristocratic repression, an attempt to portray a great passion in its effects upon those for whom the first principle of breeding is to betray no emotion. In the preface to an edition published years after he wrote: "The author, young then and of a horribly aristocratic taste, still sought for life in the classes of society that evidently no longer possess it. . . . At bottom they (his characters) were only two moral monsters and monsters through impotence—the ugliest of all, for whoever is powerful is only half a monster." Finding not only love, but the novel itself, impossible under such conditions, d'Aurevilly returned to the earlier romantic mood and manner at approximately the very moment when both Baudelaire and Flaubert were, in their different fields, subjecting themselves to a new and more rigidly impersonal discipline of expression. D'Aurevilly is anything but impersonal. He cannot keep himself out of his stories, all of which in their main actions express rather his idealized vision than his direct observation of life. His whole personality is flamboyant; and his style is like a flame flashing from a volcano that from time to time erupts and spurts streams of fiery lava in every direction. Hence is explained his lack of sympathy with the Parnassian poets. Baudelaire himself was very far from being a Parnassian. He put passion into his pursuit of the exotic, the macabre, the sinister and into his portrayal of delicate shades of corruption. This also was the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

range of d'Aurevilly's subjects. Here in both is to be found the very essence of that "demoniac tendency" which Baudelaire notes as an essential characteristic in modern art. In him it remains resolved in its metaphysical state. In d'Aurevilly it takes a theological turn and produces the devil.

Personally, however, I feel that too much stress has perhaps been laid upon the diabolism of this writer. Whatever interest it may possess in itself, it has little to do with the actual *procédés* of his art. There is not one of his stories the design of which, however much it might justify acceptance of the devil as a factor in human affairs, in any way absolutely requires his interposition as a kind of infernal *deus ex machinâ*. That is, you may take the devil or leave him, as you like. The author is merely engaged in painting human passions and their effects, and while he may hold his own opinion as to the origin of the element of corruption they contain, you may have yours, and he will take no unfair advantage of you or attempt to convert you to his cult. In "*La Vieille Maîtresse,*" where Mr. Gosse makes much of the diabolical machinery, no other magic is needed than the ascendancy of a seductive and determined woman over a man of good intentions, but weak and sensual. As for Barbey's choice of subjects, it must always be remembered that he was a romantic writer. For him, as for Byron, the criminal was fascinating because of his force and strange distinction; also because he was at war with society and set at naught the conventional moral code. Powerful, he was "only half a monster." In him something of the passion and self-reliance of the primitive man is displayed, and he may readily be made to seem heroic, superhuman. It was such a sentiment that made Stendhal in Italy welcome manifestations of atrocious crime because they proved that that country could still produce "characters." D'Aurevilly's books abound in Byronic figures, and they include women as well as men. There is this difference, however, that, while Byron's criminals derive much of their romantic suggestion from the exotic coloring of their exploits, which are commonly little more than ordinary acts of murder and rapine, d'Aurevilly's derive theirs rather from the secrecy, or from the peculiar violence and perversity, of their acts. Here he possesses a distinct advantage as a Catholic writer. For not only does the spiritual significance of crime become immeasurably deepened and intensified when it is regarded as sin,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the casuistry of the Catholic conscience, developed through the secular experience of the confessional, suggests varieties and subtleties of wrong-doing that the less completely evolved legal and social conscience cannot compete with.

But there is also another distinction to be made. D'Aurevilly has drawn one type that is altogether different from any to be found in Byron. This is the absolute criminal. A great crime is ordinarily represented as entailing a moral crisis. Remorse, mingled with Satanic pride, is the very key-note of Byron's criminals, as it is of Lucifer. Nothing, indeed, is more difficult to draw than a human being from whom all sense of guilt is eliminated. Such a character—we may take the Marquise in "*Les Liaisons Dangereuses*" as an example—is likely to suffer in its sense of reality, unless, indeed, as in Feuillet's "*La Morte,*" it is presented as frankly pathological. D'Aurevilly presents two such individuals, strangely instinct with life and artistic truth, in one of the stories in "*Les Diaboliques,*" where he depicts the passion of a man and a woman who deliberately put out of their way the obstacle to their union. The situation is the same as that in one of the episodes of "*Pippa Passes,*" but the moral issues are wholly different. Having attained their end, there is no after-weakening, no moral deterioration on either side, only the serene enjoyment of a happiness in no wise affected by the nature of the acts through which it was acquired. The implied moral of the story would evidently seem to be that, as Maeterlinck says in "*Les Trésor des Humbles,*" "the soul may retain its innocence even in the midst of a great crime." There is, however, on d'Aurevilly's part, no attempt to draw a moral, to establish a mystical law. He presents his man and woman frankly as exceptions, and it is just because they are exceptional, and because the incident is precisely a singular and disconcerting paradox of criminal psychology, that they interest him and the reader. These people, one feels, live in a region "beyond good and evil." Thus in them d'Aurevilly anticipates the theory of the Superman. That, being of the elect who win the right to a special moral standard by living up to the full level of their passions, they are, from d'Aurevilly's point of view, the elect of the devil rather than of nature, constitutes the only divergence from Nietzsche's idea. And this is merely a superficial difference, after all. If the German is a Greek at heart, d'Aurevilly is a child of the early

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Renaissance. He is, as it were, a Pollaiuolo of the pen. He is absorbed and fascinated by manifestations of power and forms of personal distinction. The devil still terrifies him. This shows itself in contortion and grimace. But he is already beginning to feel the fiend disssolving into the complexity of natural forces and to interpret these physically and psychologically. Meanwhile the pagan finds, or believes to find, a certain support in the primitive Christian—a justification for the broad and liberal representation of life to which he is drawn. The plea which he makes in the preface to "*L'Ensorcelée*" is ingenious and characteristic:

"As for the manner [he says] in which the author . . . has described the effects of passion and sometimes spoken its language, he has used that great Catholic breadth which does not fear to touch the human passions, when this creates terror at its consequences. A novelist, he has accomplished his task of novelist which is to paint the heart of man in strife with sin, and he has painted it without embarrassment and false shame. It would please unbelievers to have the things of the imagination and the heart—that is to say, the novel and the drama—at least half of the human soul, forbidden to Catholics, under the pretext that Catholicism is too severe to occupy itself with this sort of subject. . . . On this count a Catholic Shakespeare would not be possible, and Dante even would have passages that would have to be suppressed."

Here one is reminded of Francis Thompson's plea in the proem to his "Shelley" for a larger Catholic view of the nature and functions of poetry. Such pleas, however, have never been heeded by the Church since it has been necessary to make them at all. Certainly history would seem to show that a Catholic Shakespeare is impossible, since he has never appeared, while the distance of Dante merely serves to show how far Catholicism has travelled since pre-Reformation days when the Church still conserved the traditions of paganism. If d'Aurevilly actually believed that his profession of an edifying purpose would set him right with Christian orthodoxy he was sorely mistaken, and he might as well have made full profession of paganism. It is one thing to accept the devil (which must to-day be done very softly and apologetically by all creeds) and another to accord him a seat in the sanctuary. Hence like another but unrepentant Tannhäuser, d'Aurevilly was dismissed from the conclave and left free to return to the Horselberg of his imagination. And for him no staff has ever broken into miraculous blossom. "*Les Dia-*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

boliques," in which, indeed, the flimsy pretext of a moral intention is more or less abandoned, was prosecuted on its appearance, being the third of the famous trilogy of works thus treated in France during the nineteenth century. The other two were, of course, *"Madame Bovary"* and *"Fleurs du Mal."* The author was discharged, but public sentiment has never quite acquitted him of crime in the execution of that daring but profoundly beautiful and artistic work.

So much for the general cast of d'Aurevilly's imagination. Now as to the material in which it sought mainly to realize itself. He was the scion of an old family of the old Norman bourgeoisie that had been ennobled by royal patent not long before the Revolution. His birthplace was Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, near Valognes, in the peninsula of Cotentin. In this remote corner of Basse-Normandie, during the latter years of the Revolution, there broke out, and was maintained with a terrible passion of hatred on both sides, that sinister and clandestine civil warfare known in history as *"La Chouannerie du Cotentin."* D'Aurevilly had heard stories in his youth of this local strife, and the incidents and personalities of some of the principal actors had powerfully impressed his imagination. It was natural, therefore, that he should conceive the idea of writing a series of novels of which the Chouannerie should be the theatre, when it was not the subject. No adequate account had ever been written of the Chouannerie, which was overshadowed by the more significant and spectacular struggle in the Vendée. Here, then, was a fresh field—or all but fresh, for Balzac had already written his novel *"Les Chouans"*—and one peculiarly suited to the requirements of the historical novelist, because of "the shadows and species of historic mystery which surround it." He had, moreover, as he believed, material of which no one else was in possession. Scott was his model. In the introduction to *"L'Ensorcelée"* he writes: "One asks himself what the illustrious author of the Chronicles of the Canongate would have made of the chronicles of the Chouannerie if, instead of being a Scotchman, he had been a Breton or Norman." The three stories which he completed—he projected others—are his answer to his question.

"Le Chevalier des Touches" alone has the war, or an episode of the war, for its immediate subject. The Chevalier is one of those mysterious Byronic personages who stalk across d'Aure-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

villy's pages. He is the principal agent of the *emigrés* in the Cotentin country and seems to bear a charmed life, for he succeeds miraculously in eluding the traps of his pursuers who hunt him as if he were a wild beast. He is, however, finally captured and condemned to death. The Chouans, in despair, plan a desperate rescue. Twelve men disguised as corn-dealers go to Avranches, where he is confined, on the day of the market, and while one of the number seeks by strategy to gain access to the prisoner, the others, by way of creating a diversion, start a disturbance among the booths. This speedily becomes a riot. Surrounded by throngs of peasants who speedily discover their identity, the Chouans fight back to back, laying open faces by the score with the long, terrible whips they had brought concealed beneath their smocks. A stampede of the cattle tethered in the market-place is all that saves the little band, which, having failed in its attempt, slowly makes its retreat along lanes opened by horns and hoofs. A second expedition is successful, and the Chevalier escapes to England in the tiny shallop he keeps concealed in a cave on the seacoast. This is all there is to the story, or nearly all, for there is a slender thread of romantic love interwoven with the main action. It is thus not precisely a novel, but a tale. And as there is no complication of plot, its effectiveness proceeds almost entirely from the manner in which it is told, and from the personality of the supposed narrator. This a *vieille fille* of good family, a veritable Amazon, who had herself participated in the second expedition. The scene of the recital is a quiet provincial drawing-room, where a group of old Chouans congregate years after the events recorded, and the savage violence of the tale is thus thrown into vivid contrast with the peaceful repose of an interior as quotidian as one of Maeterlinck's. All the portraits —the delicate spinsters with their needlework, the old baron intent on the delights of the tea-table, and the aristocratic abbé with his witty sallies—are sketched with an exquisite delicacy that does not preclude broad, bold strokes of characterization. These are particularly telling in the case of the Amazon, whose grotesque ugliness, brusque masculine speech and peremptory gesture make her the perfect type of the old soldier in petticoats. D'Aurevilly is a master of portraiture and can suggest the very atmosphere of personality. A similar atmosphere he succeeds in disengaging even from inanimate objects, so that in this story the spirit of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the past exudes from the gray, wainscoted walls and time-darkened portraits of the salon with a subtlety that makes d'Aurevilly the predecessor of Mr. Henry James in this manner of mute evocation. In the events themselves, one will note the bent of the author to interpret high action heroically, to see life in a sublime light of daring and sacrifice, and to extract from even the most trivial incident an epic significance. The episode which is elaborated to make "*Le Chevalier des Touches*" is of the slightest importance in itself. But the manner in which it is seen would make it fit into the Æneids of a new Troy, while the life led by the heroic women in the château de Touffedelys is of a spirit not essentially different from that which we may suppose to have animated life in the high towers of Ilion.

This same heroicizing tendency, if I may call it so, finds, perhaps, its most exalted expression in one of the stories in "*Les Diaboliques,*" where its almost dazzling purity is enhanced by the murky and infernal fires which light that book of strange passions and perversities. A group of old Napoleonic soldiers, brutal atheists of the Age of Reason and the bivouac, feast together regularly on the Friday of each week to publish their defiance of all religion. Harmless enough they are, with all their swaggering bluster, these old Jacobins and *grognards.* On the present occasion, however, one of the *convives* tells the story of a young girl of the Vendée who had served as the agent of the proscribed priests. When she was captured she was found to carry the sacramental wafers concealed upon her person. Seizing these, her captors cast them to the swine. This story is received with great gusto, and is roundly applauded by the majority of the listeners, who glory in the outrage to the most precious symbols of the Christian faith, and indulge in gross witticisms at the girl's expense. But there is one man at the table who, younger and less hardened than the rest, flashes out in protest. How can they miss, he asks, the true tragic significance of the story they have just heard? For them, since they professed not to believe in the validity of the sacraments, there could be no sacrilege in their insult. Not so for the girl. Why did they treasure their medals they had won on the field of honor? Was it not because these were the very incarnation of the Emperor, and because, in wearing them, they thus bore him above their hearts? Then, instead of covering her with their slime, they should understand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and pity the poor child who carried concealed within her breast the divine body of her Lord, and for whom, therefore, the act of her captors was of the last horror. *Sava indignatio* can rarely have found a more superb denunciatory gesture than in this speech which glorifies, with supreme tenderness and beauty, the figure of a simple peasant girl who, in her humble act of piety and devotion, is one with the heroic maid.

"*Le Chevalier des Touches*" is the best of d'Aurevilly's books in most ways, as it is also the most accessible in its style and spirit to the general reader. The other two books in the series, "*Un Prêtre Marié*" and "*L'Ensorcelée,*" are more sinister in subject and atmosphere, and especially in the former, which is the longer, are more overloaded with descriptive and dithyrambic passages that obstruct the narrative. D'Aurevilly is lyrical by genius, and he has a tendency to chant his stories, as it were, somewhat in the bardic manner of Ossian. Still, they are powerful and imaginative works, and "*L'Ensorcelée*" is a book to set side by side with the "*Chevalier*" to complete the portrait of the author's mind and genius. It, too, tears asunder the veil that surrounds the Chouannerie with historic mystery, but it does this in a manner more incidental. Its background is rather the Cotentin in the years immediately succeeding the Revolution, when the country had relapsed into the quiet of its old ways, though the mind of the people was still harrowed by those moral disturbances which mark the passing of an old order. Still more fundamentally, however, the action of the story proceeds from the spiritual qualities, qualities of impressionability and superstitious awe, that have always characterized the descendants of the old Norman race. It is a wild and fantastic tale, involving the operation of a gypsy curse and many other elements of the marvellous, and it would be impossible to present a brief summary without rendering a false impression of almost absurd extravagance. The extravagance is undoubtedly there, but, in spite of this, the story remains affecting and impressive, and he would be a *blasé* and sophisticated reader indeed who did not receive from it a thrill of very real pity and terror. Here again, as in "*Le Chevalier des Touches,*" the secret of the effectiveness of the story lies altogether in the art of the narrator. Dealing in the supernatural, giving the events precisely as they were given to him by an unsceptical Norman farmer, the author prepares

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his ground carefully from the outset, so that, the reader having become thoroughly imbued with the mystery of broad and desolate Landes, where the scene is laid, the spell of the legendary spirit of the past, and the naïve poetry of a race profoundly attached to the occult element in its religion, he is predisposed to receive something of the same impression from the narrative which the events themselves produced upon the simple and credulous peasants of the Cotentin at the time of their occurrence. Moreover, as d'Aurevilly himself points out, if there are elements of the marvellous, there are also events produced by the shock of emotions and the inveteration of sentiments which give the story of the bewitched woman and her sinister destiny a tragic pathos and a human truth and reality. For the rest, we are certainly familiar enough with this type of story in English literature where the introduction of the marvellous is a deliberate device designed to give ingenuity to the invention and a most natural heightening to the drama of emotions. The ghosts of Shakespeare and the witches' cauldron do not in the least detract from the truth of the fables in which they figure. Scott employs apparitions and invokes supernatural forces, and does this far more artificially than does d'Aurevilly, who, as I have said, always leaves a psychologic loophole of escape for the incredulous. Among other modern story-tellers, Mr. Watts-Dunton has given an admirable example of this *genre* in his "Aylwin," with all the familiar machinery of the curse and its effects. In this instance, however, the occult acquires a special spiritual significance in itself apart from the imaginative use that is made of it. While not interpreted in the spirit of gross popular superstition, it is, nevertheless, conceived as possessing a certain character of truth for those who read all physical phenomena in a spiritual sense. In the same way d'Aurevilly may also be regarded as an apostle of "the renascence of wonder." And though he may solemnly cite "the irrefragable attestation" of the Church as his ultimate authority, one may nevertheless feel that if he does not dismiss the marvellous with the contemptuous scorn of the cultivated, the real reason is because, for him, the marvellous is not restricted to any particular manifestations, but pervades all life.

The important thing for us to note at this point is, however, not that he professed a sort of philosophical belief in the potency of gypsy charms and incantations, but that he described the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gypsies; not that he assumed as a fact "the intervention of occult and evil powers in the struggles of humanity," but that he portrayed the lives of those for whom such intervention was a vital part of their religious belief. He is as much dominated by his human material as by his imaginative motives and spiritual conceptions. He had a set purpose in his stories, over and above the poetical representation of life in the abstract as a conflict for man's soul. This was to bring into literature the moral and social life of those remnants of the old Norman race which persisted, after so many centuries, in out-of-the-way corners of the land wrested by Rollo and his freebooters from the French. He carries out this purpose with singular completeness, and with an insight born of perfect racial sympathy. Into his portraits he puts all his intimate knowledge of the people, and aims to incorporate in them every distinctive trait, even to the precise shape of their speech—thus anticipating Maupassant in the same general locality—the style of their dress, and their physical characteristics. The racial traits are always kept clear and continuous even in the most highly individualized creations and through all classes of society, so that his characters, high and low, seem to constitute a single family. And with the people he gives, at the same time, the environment in which they live, which has moulded them. D'Aurevilly's sensibility to landscape impressions, especially in the broad, grandiose and mysterious aspects of nature and of nature saturated with human associations and sentiment, is extraordinarily great. His description of the Landes of Lessay at nightfall may be compared, by no means to its disadvantage, with Hardy's magnificent and weird evocation of the Wessex heath in "The Return of the Native," while the wild pictures of the seacoast in "*La Vieille Maîtresse*"—of which, with the rest of his books, limitations of space make it impossible to examine more particularly in this article—challenge comparison with similar scenes in "The Pirate," to which reference is made more than once in the text, and which was, apparently, one of the favorite imaginative works of a writer uncommonly familiar with English literature, and as well acquainted with Burns, Byron, and Crabbe as with Scott.

All this side of d'Aurevilly's work has its special significance from the point of view of French literature. Says M. Remy de Gourmont:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It is d'Aurevilly who has created in France the '*roman de terroir*'; nothing like it, having literary value, exists before '*Le Chevalier des Touches*,' '*L'Ensorcelée*.' '*Un Prêtre Marié*.' The province painted by Balzac is not a particular province, far less a limited corner of a country, known, felt, loved, since infancy; Balzac wishes to give the Province as he gives Paris, and he places these two terms in a state of opposition which has become traditional and banal. Barbey d'Aurevilly regards only one canton, but in this he embraces all, earth, sea and sky, villages and cities, nobility, bourgeoisie, peasants, fishers."

Thus, deriving from Châteaubriand as a romantic writer, he diverges from him in finding at home that opportunity to "return to nature" which the author of "*Atala*" and "*René*" had sought in the forests of America. The suggestion he undoubtedly received from Scott, who had many French admirers—both Stendhal and Balzac—but none who entered so intimately into the sources of his inspiration. He is a disciple of the Wizard of the North, but no mere imitator. His books are filled with the spirit of a peculiar past, and with impressions of things seen and felt with marvellous emotional responsiveness and freshness of poetic insight. The full measure of his originality may be perceived in his style, which is like that of no other French writer, though its framework is the rhetoric of romanticism. Thus it is elaborate, ornate and often tortuously involved, but it is at the same time nervous, sinuous and expressive in every phrase. There is in its slow and measured movement a note of *hauteur* and hatred of the vulgar, yet the intensity of the life that inhabits it is shown by the power it possesses of generating images. In these, the material for which is supplied not merely by wide reading, but by a penetrating observation of the minute and curious concrete facts of physical life, the sensibility of the man is completely incorporated. All that was truly Satanic in his soul insinuated itself into words which writhe like a nest of snakes and hiss like the coil of a whip wielded by one of his Chouan heroes. Wherever it falls, this lash, wrapping itself around the firm flesh of a fact, leaves a livid line or a trail of blood. It is this style that imparts most life to d'Aurevilly's books to-day, and will cause them to be read most eagerly in the future by all for whom the perfect crystallization of a rare and exotic personality always presents an irresistible appeal.

WILLIAM ASPENWALL BRADLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHANGING POSITION OF AMERICAN TRADE.

BY THOMAS A. THACHER.

WHEN, in 1904, the well-known English grain expert, Mr. G. V. S. Broomhall, wrote that in his opinion the United States was destined to shift slowly from the position of an exporter of surplus wheat to that of a wheat importer, little attention was attracted in America and the beliefs of the Englishman were considered merely as a rather dubious theory. Two years later when a man so thoroughly acquainted with American conditions as Mr. James J. Hill declared, in a speech before the Minnesota State Fair, that within twenty years the wheat raised in the United States would be insufficient for domestic consumption, his statements were also set down as relating to a distant period in no immediate connection with present-day finance. Yet during the last twelve months a constantly more threatening cloud has arisen on our financial horizon in the shape of a shrinking balance of trade caused largely by the fact that in recent years American grain exports have been steadily declining.

Dealing concisely with the statistics of our foreign trade during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1910, we find startling results. In the face of a great revival of business during the summer months of 1909 and its steady increase into 1910, our annual trade balance fell lower than it has been since 1895-8. After a continuous record of monthly export balances of merchandise for the twelve years ending June 30th, 1909, five out of the following twelve months showed balances of imports. The prospects for the current fiscal year are not promising. In July, the first month of the year, imports again exceeded exports by $2,818,000.

How poor a comparison the trade balance for the last fiscal year makes with the records of the several years preceding is shown by the following table:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fiscal year ending June 30.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
1910	$1,744,900,000	$1,557,800,000	$187,100,000
1909	1,663,000,000	1,311,900,000	351,000,000
1908	1,860,700,000	1,194,300,000	666,400,000
1907	1,880,800,000	1,434,400,000	446,400,000
1906	1,743,800,000	1,226,500,000	517,300,000
1905	1,518,500,000	1,117,500,000	401,000,000
1900	1,394,400,000	849,900,000	544,500,000

While *prima facie* the decline in our trade balance seems almost wholly due to the increase in our imports, yet the seriousness of the situation is apparent when the steady decline in grain exports is considered. In comparing the largest items in the exports, we find that the proportion of breadstuffs has been falling off while manufactures have been increasing.

Fiscal Year.	Foodstuffs.	Breadstuffs.	Manufactured Products.
1910	21.5%	7.6%	44.9%
1909	26.7	9.6	41.0
1908	28.4	11.5	40.9
1907	27.6	9.7	39.9
1906	30.5	10.7	39.9
1900	40.0	18.8	35.4

The falling off in wheat and corn shipments have been very marked in the last twelve months. With a wheat harvest, in 1909, of 737,000,000 bushels, exceeded only once in our history, we find the abnormally small exports in the fiscal year just ended of only 88,100,000 bushels of wheat and flour valued at $95,481,000. Except during 1904-05, when the 1904 crop was only 552,000,000 bushels, the wheat exports of 1909-10 were smaller than any year since 1876-77. The decline in wheat shipments has been going on for some years. Thus the average number of bushels of wheat and flour exported annually in the five years ending June 30th, 1904, was 192,600,000 bushels, while from 1905 to June 30th, 1909, it averaged only 115,000,000 bushels. This decrease in exports resulted, in spite of an increase in annual production, from an average of 625,100,000 bushels from 1899-1903 to 655,800,000 in 1904-09. The harvests of calendar years ending in 1908 resulted in the exports for the years ending June 30th, 1909, first given. Although the corn crop of 2,772,000,000 bushels was the second largest crop recorded in the United States, only 36,800,000 bushels were shipped as compared with the average annual export in the five years before of 48,300,000 bushels. That the corn is not being sent abroad indirectly through feeding to hogs and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cattle later shipped is shown by the steady decline in our meat exports. Meat and dairy shipments fell from $192,802,000 in 1908, and from $166,521,000 for 1909, to $130,632,000 in the fiscal year just ended. Cattle and hog exports were valued at only $12,246,000 in 1910 as compared with $18,190,000 in 1909 and $29,646,000 for the year before.

This decrease in the value of our exported breadstuffs naturally causes apprehension in the ordinary business man, schooled in his belief in the exportable surplus of the crops as the greatest source of a favorable trade balance. At once the question arises: will the cereal surplus continue to decrease, and if so, what effect will it have upon the business of the country?

Stripped of all minor causes, the fundamental reason for the decline in grain exports undoubtedly is that the United States is to-day consuming an increasing amount of breadstuffs. The increased production of wheat brought about by larger acreage or by a greater number of bushels per acre has not kept pace with the growth of population. This fact has been apparent during the last ten years. The average annual production of wheat from 1906-10 was only 4.8 per cent. greater than from 1900-04, while the estimated population was 8 per cent. greater in the second than in the first period.* In addition to this a recent investigation made by the United States Department of Agriculture showed an increase in domestic consumption of wheat annually of from 5.11 bushels per capita in 1900 to 6.34 in 1908. Even if the increase were only one bushel per inhabitant from 1900 to 1910, it is seen that the additional wheat required because of this alone would be at least 88,000,000 bushels in ten years. Between the growing population in our country and the enlarged consumption of wheat by each inhabitant, one cannot wonder that experts differ as to how much over 10,000,000 bushels annual increase the United States must have in order to maintain her place as an exporter of wheat. Certainly, however, the dismay excited by the early indications during this present year of a crop of only about 640,000,000 bushels of wheat is more easily understood.

The decrease in wheat produced per capita has been naturally accompanied by a rise in prices in the United States. For the 1909 wheat crop the average price received by the grower was

* Population estimated at 90,000,000 in 1910. Wheat crop of 1910 estimated at 675,000,000 bushels.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

99 cents per bushel, as against 92.8 in 1908, 87.4 in 1907, 66.7 in 1906, and 74.8 in 1905. These high prices for American wheat have not been followed closely by the world's market price set in Liverpool. While the price of wheat received by the average American farmer rose 20.4 per cent. in the years 1905-09 over the years 1900-04, the average Liverpool cash price rose only 17 per cent. Where the wheat-importing nations once looked almost wholly to America for their wheat, they are now relying largely on other countries.

How great a change in this direction has taken place is indicated by the following statistics published in the "London Economist" of May 14th, 1910.

Proportion of imports of wheat to the United Kingdom from various countries:

	1900-1902. Three years' average.	1903-1909. Seven years' average
United States	62%	27%
Argentine	10	19
India	4	14
Russia	4	14
Canada	9	12
Other Countries	11	14
	100	100

The same changing conditions which have affected wheat have had a similar influence upon corn shipments and such other exports as depended upon the former state of agriculture in America. Mr. J. Ogden Armour, in speaking of the shipping of cattle abroad, said in a recent newspaper interview:

"The meat export business from the United States to Europe is dead. South America is furnishing the meat that Europe consumes, and this country cannot compete with advantage with South America. Cattle conditions there are as they were in the West twenty-five years ago."

Contemplation of the present state of our wheat production gives little encouragement to those who desire America to regain her position as the cereal-exporter among nations. Even if millions of dollars are spent upon reclaiming the arid soils of the West, yet the increased acreage thus obtained hardly seems likely to do more than relieve the rapidly rising prices for wheat in this country. Undoubtedly scientific intensive farming will be practised to a constantly increasing extent, but if the Liver-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pool price does not rise greatly, such methods can hardly be relied upon to keep the American price down to an export basis.

If the United States is to maintain her present international position, although her crops can no longer be depended upon to build favorable trade balances, her exports must be increased in another direction. The shipping of manufactured goods alone is a field sufficient to sustain our future progress as a trading nation. Increasing exports of manufactures must take the place of the declining shipments of grain.

It should be recognized that the natural strength of the United States as an exporter of cereals is very different from her position as an exporter of factory products. It is not hard for a nation which produces a larger part of the grain consumed by cereal-importing countries to keep its trade balance favorable. All nations must eat, and short harvests in the producing country, if its crop is of sufficient proportion to the world's production, will be compensated for by a rise in prices. In the past the United States has had an invincible superiority in grain production because of the vast amount of land suitable for cultivation. No amount of agricultural knowledge, cheap labor or reasonable transportation charges can make one nation possessing very limited areas of grain country become a successful competitor with another nation endowed with great tracts of fertile, cereal-growing soil, although handicapped by high wages, costly freight rates and a low degree of knowledge as to scientific farming. In developing manufactured exports America competes with the advanced nations of Europe upon what is practically an even basis. Commercial credit, wide-spread knowledge as to foreign markets, cheap transportation, low wages, etc., will be the determining factors in this struggle for trade. Whatever the great areas of fertile, well-watered land one nation may possess, they will count for very little. The problem of the United States in the future is to keep the prices of manufactured articles down to an export basis. As is the case with wheat, the manufactures must be kept at a price where they will be taken for foreign markets. Once above this export point, American shipments will be little influenced, no matter how high the prices are pushed. No goods will go.

To reduce prices it is evident that American manufacturers must cut down the cost of production. The chief item in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cost of production to-day is the expensivenss of labor. High wages must be brought down. American brains working out improved machinery and labor-saving devices will do much, but the future success of America in foreign trade lies in the ability of her labor to successfully compete with the so-called "pauper labor" of Europe, which has so often figured as a bogy in our political campaigns. American ability counts more in the manufacture of many of our present exports than it will in those goods which we must sell abroad in the future. Steel products made by gigantic and newly equipped plants, hardware and such articles as typewriters and fountain-pens depend far more for their cost upon the skill of the manufacturer than do cotton cloths or woollen goods. We have developed an excellent market for articles which our ingenuity has allowed us to make cheaply. In the future we must rely more on the growing inexpensiveness of our labor. For the successful development of exports of such goods as print cloths and wool manufactures American labor must not receive very much more than does European labor of the same grade.

Obviously the present wages paid in this country cannot be cut down without material reductions in the high prices now charged for the necessaries of life. It would be folly to expect the working-man to receive peacefully wages in any way comparing to those paid in Europe until he can buy his wants for approximately the European price. He must live very much as he does to-day. Breadstuffs can always be obtainable as cheaply in America as in England, unless prices are allowed to be forced up behind a tariff wall. Clothing, shoes and other factory goods must gradually fall in value if employers do not wish to continue the present price of labor. The present system of high wages and high cost of living must be followed by lower wages and lower cost of living. By such a change the standards of the working-man would not be affected, but the ability of our nation to export manufactured goods would be greatly increased. The whole scale of prices in America, carried as it is to a very artificial height in many directions, must work down toward a European basis.

This decline of inflated American prices to more nearly the European levels lies before us to-day. It is almost America's only choice. The United States is in a very different position from that of Great Britain. We own almost no ocean liners and receive negligible freight money; we have only small in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vestments abroad and collect very little in dividends, interest or rents; our tourists spend millions each year on the Continent—every factor in exchange has been working against us except our preponderating trade balance resulting from merchandise exports. While a decline in imports may easily take place during the next twelve months, our present position as a nation is only to be held if our imports naturally grow but our exports increase as rapidly. If we were content to do less and less trade each year in order to preserve a favorable balance, the future greatness of this country would indeed be little assured.

Such a readjustment of prices may take place easily, or it may be a slow and painful process accompanied by distressing industrial times and carrying with it suffering, bitterness and political chaos. If such a period of business depression does come about Americans can rest confident that from the peril of such a crisis our nation will rise more firmly established than ever before in its position as a leader of the industrial powers. Our present price level blocks our progress. When, however, America's prices are sufficiently low, we can rely upon astute diplomatists, a wise and far-sighted State Department, and a large, well-equipped navy to secure our nation advantageous privileges in foreign markets—but the days when Europe must buy from us or go without many of the necessaries of life are fast coming to an end.

THOMAS A. THACHER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PUBLIC AND THE CONSERVATION POLICY.*

BY J. R. MCKEE.

IT is the purpose of the writer not to give expression to his personal views, but to offer statements of conditions as they exist to-day, leaving for each reader to draw his own conclusions.

We will begin at the essential question of titles in connection with public lands upon which it may be desired to locate a water-power. All of these discussions, of course, have to do with the Western States and those few Southern States where there are still public lands, namely, Florida, Alabama and Mississippi, and have no bearing whatsoever on situations in the East where the lands have long since passed into private ownership. The one essential thing to keep in mind, however, in considering this question, is that in the Western States of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming, the water as such belongs to the States and any title to it must be acquired from the State. As a broad proposition these titles are acquired by filing applications for a given amount of water, and putting the same to actual or so-called beneficial use, this use varying somewhat in the different States as to whether it is supplied for mining, irrigation, domestic or power purposes. Title cannot be acquired to the water, however, until it has been applied to actual use. In other words, you cannot locate on a given amount of water and, without using it, retain title. It must not only be located upon, but must actually be applied to the respective purpose for which filing is made. It does not necessarily follow that you can locate upon it for one purpose only, for you can recite any one or the several different purposes and apply it

* Read before the National Electric Light Association at its thirty-third convention held at St. Louis, Missouri, May 26th, 1910.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accordingly. In the other Western States, including California, Oregon and Washington, the doctrine of riparian rights (the common-law rule) obtains, and that is the right of the proprietor of the adjoining land to the flow of the water of the stream. This right does not depend upon usage, but passes with the soil.

At the time when the respective laws were enacted which helped the building-up of the West, the question of generating power by electricity from water-powers and transmitting it therefrom was not a known development, and, therefore, the laws which were then enacted have to do particularly with the granting of rights for domestic uses, ditch companies, irrigation companies and manufacturing. Under the plea of the conservationists and the claims which have been put forth by the enthusiasts of the Forest Service, it is questionable whether many of the water-powers which have been installed under such rights as have been granted by the Federal authorities in the past eight or ten years can claim a title to the property upon which they have built. In other words, the water-power companies, as such, located on the public domain have been given by the Secretary of the Interior what are known as revocable rights, it being claimed by the Federal officers that this is the only form of authority which they are authorized to grant.

This revocable right, briefly, is a right which is granted by the Secretary of the Interior to utilize the public lands for the conveying of water to be used for power, but "Revocable at the option of the Secretary." Of course, it was claimed this contemplated that if the right was legitimately used and expenditures properly made, and the development carried to a conclusion, ours being an honorable Government, and the people of the country able to depend upon their high officials being dignified men, no possible trouble would ever result from any Secretary undertaking, after work was done, to deliberately confiscate property or ruin titles by attempting to revoke such rights, and that if he did attempt to do it the probabilities were that, the companies having proceeded under this revocable right and completed the work, the title, without regard to any further act on the part of the Secretary, had passed by reason of prior statutes which convey title upon the completion of the work.

Addressing ourselves, however, to the character of protection

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is afforded by depending upon the personnel of the Government officials, I have before me some data which were exceedingly difficult to obtain. In fact, after it had been promised on one or two occasions by the officials of the Forest Service, they still withheld it, and it was only after enlisting the assistance of certain United States Senators who demanded the information that it was forthcoming. This is a list which is the result of action on the part of ex-Secretary-of-the-Interior Garfield and Secretary-of-Agriculture Wilson, the latter, it is understood, acting under the suggestion of Mr. Pinchot, when on March 2d, 1909, which you will note was just two days before Mr. Garfield was to go out of office, there was issued a list of what is called the "Decisions of March 2d, 1909," by which "Permits issued by the Secretary of the Interior under Act of February 15th, 1901," were revoked. This list covers forty different plants. The names of these plants are withheld because it would only serve to complicate titles, but it is worth while to know that these revocations were issued without advising with, or granting any hearing whatsoever to, the representatives of any of the water-power companies. Some of the plants had been completed and were in operation, and upon others hundreds of thousands of dollars had been expended. In other words, ex-Secretary Garfield, who is supposed to be a gentleman of dignity and honorable in his dealings, and Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, the latter acting under the suggestion, it is understood, of Mr. Pinchot, had deliberately undertaken to destroy any titles whatsoever to existing properties upon which millions of dollars had been expended, and without even allowing a hearing of any kind, or giving any advance notice whatsoever to the parties concerned.

In these days of attempting to do everything by law, it is certainly difficult enough to keep everything in absolute compliance with the terms and stipulations which it is claimed the law imposes. To undertake, however, to deal with an administration which deliberately says they are doing things the law does not specifically authorize, simply because the law does not specifically prohibit, makes the situation peculiarly difficult. Starting out with what was supposed to be the preservation of our forests, and I am sure every one believes in and wishes the proper preservation of our forests, and hiding under that cloak, the last administration had withdrawn from entry—and the present administration has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

followed the same policy—hundreds of thousands, up into the millions, of acres of land, for every conceivable purpose, stating generally, however, that it was for the purpose of creating forest reserves. This plea, however, finally got to be grotesque when it was demonstrated they were withdrawing cliffs thousands of feet in the air, and perfectly barren and desert lands upon which forests never had grown and never could be made to grow, until eventually it was admitted that they were *not* withdrawing them for forest reserves, etc., but for power sites and other purposes. The present administration, however, have gone so far as to withdraw all lands upon which it was thought possible to find oil, gas, coal or phosphate, and have admitted they have done this simply because they were not prohibited by law from doing it. Mr. Taft so admitted in his speech made a short time ago in Chicago. He has asked, however, that Congress protect his acts by passing a law making legal these withdrawals, a retroactive law, if you please. That Congress recognizes this condition is pretty well shown by the considerable number of bills bearing on the subject which have been introduced in the last Congress. The general tenor in every one of them is something to the effect that "All such withdrawals heretofore made and now existing are hereby ratified and confirmed as though made under this Act."

It is difficult enough to comply with the construction of the laws as they actually exist, but we have also to deal with a situation where officials do acts in expectation that laws will be made later on to ratify them, and it is puzzling to know just where the private citizen, who is endeavoring to promote enterprises and develop the country, is going to get off, or get on, whichever way you wish to put it. If those holding public offices can pursue a policy of this character, we can easily anticipate what would happen if they saw fit to carry it beyond the question of public lands and introduce the same methods in the direction of assessing taxes and tariffs, just because they are not prohibited by law. Continuing this along other lines, it would only be a question of how far it could go before the people would insist on calling a halt.

One of the so-called "offences" which the Government officials claim has been committed by the "Interests" is that frauds have been perpetrated by entries being made on lands taken up for certain prescribed uses which were not those for which they were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actually intended. For instance, it was claimed that large tracts of timber land had been acquired by locating as placer-mining claims good timber lands, it being stated that these withdrawals of land for placer-mining claims when intended to cover timber was a fraud. Undoubtedly, if such a thing was done it was fraudulent, but if it be a crime for private interests to attempt to do this, why is it not also a crime for Government officials to go ahead as they have been doing, withdrawing thousands of acres of land under the plea of its being for the purpose of creating forest reserves, etc., which they afterward admitted were solely for the purpose of securing water-power sites, or lands having coal, gas and other deposits? When a citizen does it the Government can proceed against him officially, but when Government officials do it there is no way to have such acts brought into the courts because no action under existing laws can be brought against the Government. In other words, the Government officials commit what when the same acts are committed by private citizens are called crimes, but if done by Government officials sworn to execute the laws they expect you to regard as virtues.

To give a concrete illustration of the arbitrary way the situation has been dealt with, if you are raising grain on land which has been taken up from the public domain and you wish to transport it to market, and in doing so you are obliged to construct a roadway across public lands, you are allowed to build this roadway across such lands. If in doing so you have occasion to cross a non-navigable stream running through public lands you are privileged to build a bridge across the stream for this purpose, and upon accomplishing your work the title passes. Should it, however, happen that this bridge is located at a point where there is a fall in the stream, and you take this same bridge, if you please, and instead of putting it across the stream, call it a flume and simply turn it around so that it points down the stream, and then carry water across it instead of grain, the United States Government seeks to prohibit this right, and says you cannot have the land for this use. The distinction between being allowed to carry grain across the bridge, and being denied the right to turn the bridge down the stream and flow water over it, the latter of which you also have title to by rights granted by the State, would seem to be simply one of arbitrary action on the part of the Government officials.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Addressing ourselves to the degree of intelligence and the amount of hostility which has been brought to bear on this situation, a particularly striking case is that in connection with the Niagara River. Under the administration of President Roosevelt, with Mr. Taft as Secretary of War, a convention was entered into with Canada, through what is known as the Burton Act, by which at Niagara River the United States is allowed to withdraw from that river 20,000 cubic second feet of water, while on the Canadian side 36,000 cubic second feet can be withdrawn. These figures were arrived at, so far as I have been able to ascertain, without any conclusive or proper engineering data as to what would be the effect upon the river or upon the scenic grandeur of Niagara Falls, if amounts in excess of those recited were taken from above the Falls. At the time the convention was entered into the plants on the Canadian side of the river were withdrawing, as nearly as we can estimate, a trifle over half of the amount of water allotted to the Canadian side. The plants on the American side of the river were utilizing practically all the water allotted by the Act to this side.

There is an additional unused right to 20,000 cubic second feet on the American side which had long before been granted by the State of New York, and although considerable work had been done years ago toward using this grant, and the parties owning it were ready to go ahead and complete the plant at an expenditure of twelve or fifteen millions of dollars, the convention entered into by the United States made no allowance for this water grant, and presented such complications in connection with title to the water that the undertaking has been brought to an entire stop. The question was put to Mr. Taft, Secretary of War, whether he would consent to have the United States bring an action against the company for the purpose of endeavoring to clear the title; he declined to do it, appreciating probably that since an individual is unable to bring an action against the United States the owners of this plant were absolutely helpless; and all of this was done without there having been sufficient data secured as to whether or not the additional 20,000 cubic second feet, if taken out, would have any appreciable effect on the river itself, and with every indication that it would not. This 20,000 cubic second feet of water would have given something in excess of 550,000 horse-power of energy, which together with millions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and millions of other cubic second feet of water continue to go wastefully down the river, as they have for ages past, affording the best possible illustration of the impractical results which conservation, when guided by hysteria and not by common sense, leads us into.

In the mean time the power companies on the Canadian side are continuing work, installing additional capacity in the plants already there. So absurd is this situation that one of the companies on the American side is unable to operate in full the plant which at that date was already installed, and has been obliged to go to the Canadian side, where it also has rights, and install additional apparatus on that side. While these millions of horse-power are being wasted, the city of Buffalo, we are advised, is preparing specifications for the installation of a steam plant to furnish power for pumping and the lighting of that city. In other words, here are millions of horse-power of water going to waste, which could be readily utilized without either marring the beauty of the Falls, or having any noticeable effect on them, and coal will have to be burned to meet the needs of the community.

It is a little difficult to reconcile these facts with the so-called theory of conservation, although it does match in very handsomely with some of the beautiful but impractical ideas of those who raise their eyes to the sky and parrot the word "conservation."

An interesting feature, however, of all the bills heretofore mentioned as introduced before the present Congress is that not a single one of them indicates what is to become of the lands or properties after they are withdrawn. The lands are withdrawn subject to the discretion of the President and Congress, which we suppose means that now they have them withdrawn they are going to sit and look at them for a while and consider what they will do with them. In other words, the further development of the country in the way of coal, oil, gas, water-powers, forestry, or anything else which a weird mind of one who happens to be in authority may picture, is brought to an absolutely dead stop and for an indefinite period, until somebody, just who no one seems to know, makes up his mind how we ought to go ahead again—a policy which is sadly setting back the development of many sections of the country, and which is a death-blow, for the time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being particularly, to the great Territory of Alaska. A time limit to franchise of from twenty-five to fifty years has been suggested by different members of our national Legislature in connection with recent bills. Not one of them, however, has intimated what is to become of the property at the end of this period, the presumption apparently being that at the expiration of the twenty-five or fifty year period the owners of the property will have gotten back the original cost of the property, interest on their money and profit besides. The fact should not be lost sight of that the title to the water lies with the company or citizen who has had title from the State and with which the National Government or authorities have nothing whatever to do. Any practical detail study of this subject would show that from a commercial standpoint the situation is absolutely impossible. If any one to-day should undertake a proposition of this kind on the time limit which the Government talks of imposing he would launch himself in a boat without knowing its possible destination, and would have to trust himself to the mercy of the natives upon the island where his boat might land him at the end of his journey.

It has always seemed to me that the most satisfactory way to handle the situation as a whole regarding our public lands would be to turn them over to the respective States in which they are located. Each State can look after that which applies to its own domain. The only argument ever heard advanced against this is the contemptible one that the local governments are not as cautious as the national one, and would be more vulnerable. This, however, is not an argument, but an attempt to reflect on our forms of government. There is at present too great a tendency in our Congress and the executive departments towards paternal government, and each State ought to be allowed to control and make use of the land which lies within its own domain, and this, I believe, is the solution which will eventually come about. The curious thing is that the Western Senators and Representatives do not get together on this subject and take it into their own control, as they might very readily do by unity of action.

Addressing ourselves particularly to the question of water-powers, it is unfortunate that a better comprehension does not obtain of how large an undertaking it is to discuss the water-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers of the country. I will venture to say that the railroads which run through the cañons of the West thereby destroy, by reason of occupying water grade, water-power sites for possibilities of hundreds of thousands of horse-power. Take, for example, a case in Colorado, under the last administration, where a railroad made a filing for a right-of-way through a cañon, and at the time this filing was made the construction of the road was from 100 to 125 miles away from the cañon, so there could be no question of grade entering into the discussion, or objection to the road going through the cañon at a higher elevation. At the same time, the Reclamation Bureau had lands in the same locality withdrawn for a project which contemplated building a dam at the head of this cañon and creating a reservoir which they estimated would supply water sufficient to reclaim agricultural land to the value of $30,000,000, and land which without the use of this reservoir site would, according to the official statement of the Reclamation Department engineers, forever remain as at present a sterile desert. There was also a water-power projected at the same site and filings and applications pending, from which could have been developed at least 25,000 continuous horse-power. All three of these enterprises could have been developed at this point, each without interfering with the other, it being only necessary for the railroad to go around the border of the reservoir site and through the cañon at higher than water grade. Notwithstanding this fact, and although it was presented in this way to the officials of the Government, including the President himself, the right-of-way was ordered granted by the President to the railroad company, thereby destroying the other two projects instead of allowing all three to survive. The reasons for doing this have never been made public. Government officials do not in their administration of affairs feel called upon to give reasons for their actions. Shouting "Reclamation and Conservation" from the housetops and then acting as above, all at the same time, is to say the least a bit inconsistent. They do these acts and that is the end of it. The fact remains, however, that the above case actually occurred. Perhaps the right-of-way was given simply because the recipient was a railroad; perhaps it was a matter of influence.

As for other water-power possibilities, I recall the case of a consulting engineer on hydraulic work telling me several years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ago of his having been retained to look up and locate a number of the most valuable water-power possibilities in the State of California. He jokingly told me how he regarded this commission as a very valuable one and accepted it with a great deal of pleasure. He advised his clients, however, that there was no question in his mind but that he would be able by going well over the State to locate at least one million horse-power. His commission was promptly withdrawn, the parties stating that they had no conception there was any such an amount. To this he replied that he believed there was not only that much, but double that much available in California alone. It is hardly necessary to say that this same condition prevails to a greater or lesser degree in several of the Western States. I cite this case only to emphasize how little understood are the water-power possibilities of the nation. To those familiar with the situation, it is incomprehensible that men who are assumed to possess common sense, and to have regard for integrity, can assert that the so-called water-power interests are endeavoring to control the water-powers in this country. The most difficult thing from a water-power standpoint is to find those water sites at which the cost of development would not run up to an amount prohibitive from a commercial standpoint. The continuous development of the steam-engine and the reduced cost for developing power by steam are every year making it harder to find a water-power site on which the first cost to develop would not be so high as to make it impossible to compete with the low cost of steam-generated power, particularly when it is generated by steam-turbines. The United States Government would be practising true conservation if, instead of endeavoring to add to the cost and difficulties of water-power development, they would give assistance to capital and other enterprises undertaking this development, because for every water-power that is installed proportionately that much coal and oil are saved, and thereby is accomplished true conservation of our nation's resources. The present policy of the Government, however, is going to carry us to just the other extreme. In other words, by increasing the cost of water-power development they are going to increase proportionately the amount of power generated by steam, which, of course, means the burning of oil and coal—Niagara-Buffalo, for instance.

The real difficulty in this whole situation seems to be hysteria,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and all the legislation which has been suggested, and all the rules and regulations which have been formulated in connection with water-powers, have been made by people who are not informed and who are working on theories that sound beautiful but are absolutely impractical.

Let us hope that hysteria will soon exhaust itself and allow an appeal to reason. It is to be hoped that the stagnation in the development of our public lands which will inevitably follow the present policy will bring about an era of common sense and that those in authority will be brought to understand that it would be more nearly within the duties of their high position if they found ways to induce the coming of the settler, the taking up and development of the unoccupied public domain, and the creation of wealth where barrenness and sterility now exist. Let us hope that the sober judgment of the people will condemn this policy of putting every possible obstacle in the way of development, the policy which to discover new obstacles has even gone beyond the authority of law.

J. R. McKee.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROMANTICISM IN TENNYSON AND HIS PRE-RAPHAELITE ILLUSTRATORS.

BY WILLIAM EMORY SMYSER.

ONE of the most interesting episodes in English literary history of the reign of Victoria was the publication by Edward Moxon, in 1857, of an illustrated edition of the "Poems" by Alfred Tennyson. The poetry had all appeared earlier, and had already been brought by laborious revision and careful imaginative elaboration to that richness of phrase and image, that final perfection of form to which only the supreme poetic artist of his time attained. But the designs with which the volume was enriched were new; and those in particular by the three young leaders of the Pre-Raphaelite revolt, then making a great stir in England, contribute to it a peculiar and significant charm.

Here in his eighteen drawings Millais presents the first conspicuous examples of his power in black and white, that fine sense of the dramatic and subtle feeling for illustrative meanings, which, it has been observed, appears in his paintings only on great occasions. Having an acute perception of the pictorial possibilities of the text—and Millais knew Tennyson by heart—absolute fidelity of interpretation, and the technical skill to put with a few happy touches the point of the picture beyond all doubt, working moreover in accordance with the naturalism of Pre-Raphaelite theory most congenial to him, he becomes a most instructive translator of the poet's ideas. Hunt, on the other hand, all his life the most consistent of the Pre-Raphaelites in method, in accuracy of observation, and delicacy of hand, serious and earnest in his painting as in his religious nature, invests the five poems which he selected for illustration in seven drawings, with the glow of his own refined imagination. While Rossetti—but who can speak in measured language of the five designs by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which this Ariel of art sought to interpret the romantic spirit of as many poems! They are not illustrations, but wonderful creations rather, original and occult—based indeed upon the substance of the poet's conceptions, but permeated by the artist's own intense and flaming individuality, and wrought with the glamour of his imagination into something rich and strange.

It is in this aspect that the volume derives its chief interest to the student of Tennyson. The romantic naturalism, the mediæval sense of wonder and mystery and spiritual beauty which are of the essential quality of Pre-Raphaelite art, when brought to play upon the poetry of Tennyson, interpret, and imaginatively enrich it, both in its own naturalism and its peculiar romantic character. To the student of literature, moreover, the volume is of significance in a still larger sense, in that it brings into temporary conjunction two vital, but on the whole independent, streams of romantic tendency in the sister arts of painting and poetry.

For, in spite of the fact that the term Pre-Raphaelite has been loosely and erroneously applied to his earlier poetry, Tennyson was wholly unaffected by Pre-Raphaelite theory or practice. Indeed, he stood quite apart from that great current of æsthetic interest which eventuated, let us say, in the art and poetry of William Morris, an important feature of which is the free interchange of subject between painting and poetry,—a fact all the more surprising when one recalls his personal intimacy with Hunt and Millais. Painters' poet though he was, who gave to art a richer series of subjects than almost any poet before or since his time, he yet shows in his poetry but a slender interest in the achievements of painter and sculptor, little sympathy for the aims and passions of the artist as such, and little knowledge of the ideas and privileges of art itself. There is but one reference in his verse to a masterpiece in this field,—to the hues, namely, of the Titianic Flora in "The Gardener's Daughter," and that is made by an artist-lover speaking in character. And he took Hunt to task for his beautiful drawings for "The Lady of Shalott" and "The Beggar Maid," declaring that an illustrator "ought never add anything to what he finds in the text," and remaining quite unconvinced when Hunt told him he did not enough allow for the difference of requirements in the two arts.

On the other hand, it is quite clear also that the poetry of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tennyson exercised no appreciable influence upon the art of the Pre-Raphaelites, beyond affording them a rich list of subjects for their paintings and directing them to the romances of King Arthur for much of their inspiration,—an inspiration that began with these very drawings, for Moxon found its first full expression in the unfortunate frescoes in the hall of the Oxford Union in the summer of 1857, and continued for many years. William Morris, it is true, who is the finest representative in poetry of the pure Pre-Raphaelite manner, owes a lasting debt to "The Lady of Shalott" and the ballad of "Oriana," which he knew by heart before he entered Oxford, and for which he often declared his admiration. But Rossetti for his part always preferred Malory's "*Morte d'Arthur*" to anything Tennyson ever wrote on the subject, as containing "the weird element in perfection."

Indeed, the charm of the pure romantic manner everywhere characteristic of the Brotherhood in their handling of the Arthurian story is found in Tennyson only in his earlier poems,—in "The Lady of Shalott," "Sir Galahad," and the exquisite fragment of "Sir Lancelot and Queen Guinevere," where the note sounds most clearly of all. But in "The Idylls of the King" Tennyson foregoes the romantic quality almost entirely. Not romance but refined sentiment becomes the vital principle of his imaginative rendering of this tale of a bygone age,—the presentation of modern spiritual ideals, the interpretation of the human heart in terms of the ethical feelings of the present. Over against Tennyson's story of Guinevere, her sin and remorse, forgiveness and peaceful end in the cloisters of Almesbury, William Morris, in his poem "The Defence of Guinevere," portrays the fierce passions of the Middle Ages, its cruelty of death by fire, its pagan joy in a woman's bodily beauty and in the luxuries of flesh, and the wild intoxication, the dim bewilderment of love. Tennyson's Galahad, exalted by the contemplation of heavenly mysteries and a passionate purity of soul, becomes insensible to fatigue of body and the sting of frost. But the Galahad of Morris's "Christmas Mystery" is heavy with weariness as night after night his horse "treads down alone the sere damp fern," until he is led to doubt his quest and whether it be not a fool's errand, and to envy Sir Palomydes his weary striving for the hand of Iseult and his thoughts of her, and even Lancelot his guilty dreams of Guinevere.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And yet, in spite of such differences, the romanticism of Tennyson's earlier poems and the romanticism of the Pre-Raphaelites had their root in a common origin, and drew a common inspiration from the witchery of Coleridge and Keats. In "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" and "Christabel" one is haunted by the mystery, indefiniteness, strangeness, the baffling sense of a hidden meaning behind the image, which are the essential elements of the highest romance. And through the enchantments of Keats he may come to look from

> "magic casements, opening on the foam
> Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn."

Scott, it has been pointed out,* is the poet of romantic action,—of the dress, the customs, the architecture of the Middle Ages; but of its finer spirit he was ignorant—he never drew a saint, and he apologized for his love of Gothic. But Keats and Coleridge, on the other hand, are the poets of pure romantic feeling, the interpreters of the very spirit and essence of the Middle Ages.

In the poetry of Keats in particular the Brotherhood found an inexhaustible treasure-house of subjects for their paintings. Hunt was the first of the Pre-Raphaelites to fall under the charm of "Isabella" and "The Eve of St. Agnes"; and long before the poetry of Keats had come to its own, while the original editions were still languishing under the rubbish of London book-stalls, he was reading to his friends with youthful enthusiasm the lines which a few years later inspired Millais' great picture of Lorenzo at supper with Isabella and her brothers. Rossetti, too, was early seized by the passion of Boccaccio's tale as Keats retold it, and pledged the Brotherhood to do a number of drawings on the poem,—a plan that fell through, however. But Hunt, a little later, began his picture of "Isabella, and the Pot of Basil," which was done in the early Pre-Raphaelite manner, though not completed for twenty years. From "The Eve of St. Agnes" he drew his first important picture, "The Flight of Madeline and Porphyro," where he touches the whole body of poetic detail with absolute truth and pure romance. The same poem yields, also, what is by many regarded as Millais' greatest painting, his "Eve of St. Agnes," a picture in which he realizes for all time

* Cf. Beers' *English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the romantic figure of Madeline, the moonlight falling upon her as she frees her hair of its pearls,

"Unclasps her warmed jewels one by one,"

and awaits the mystic favor of the virgin saint. This principle of romance, then, in part induced by the influence of Keats and in part the direct sequence of their interest in the art of the Middle Ages, in which they found the embodiment of all they felt art should be, is one of the primary elements of the Pre-Raphaelite spirit. And through it they found in the architecture, the dress, the customs of the Middle Ages a rich source of pictorial interest. The sculptured dead in the chapel, the cobwebbed arches, the foot-worn stones, the dusky galleries, the casements "high and triple arched," the chambers

"carved so curiously,
Carved with figures strange and sweet,
All made out of the carver's brain,"—

all these became the common property of the Brotherhood, as they are the common property of Coleridge and Keats. And with this frank mediævalism of scene and background there is closely linked a renaissance of the Catholic outlook upon this world and the next, of the monastic temper of mind, of the rites and ceremonies of the mediæval Church, embodying itself sometimes in mystical symbolism, whereby truths that baffle language may find utterance through suggestive imagery.

But the primary and essential element of the Pre-Raphaelite spirit is not romance. It is her twin-sister naturalism. For, normally and on a large scale, romance and naturalism are in essence one, romance being always analytical and experimental, issuing by a sure and certain logic in fidelity to nature and the facts of experience. It is by no mere accident of invention, for example, that Coleridge observes and describes

"The one red leaf, the last of its clan,"

on the topmost twig of the tree that sheltered Christabel. It is done in accordance with the strictest laws of romance, for which the characteristic or suggestive detail is of more significance than the orderly conception of the whole. As a consequence, romance selects and handles details always in conformity with the principle that human emotion will invest the most prosaic features of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world of nature and man with a secret and hidden charm, and transform its crudest realism into an ideal beauty that transcends all reality.

This very naturalism, in its twofold aspect, is the fundamental characteristic of all Pre-Raphaelite art. It is the animating principle that led to the formation of the Brotherhood. Hunt and Millais determined to put on canvas exactly what each saw in nature, and to do it with all truth and sincerity. Rossetti, whose aims and ideals were in reality widely different, would in time, they thought, come to work on the same principle—which, in fact, he never did. But they all drew from the living model, and spared no effort to find for every picture a fit and appropriate background in nature. "Every Pre-Raphaelite background," said Ruskin in his memorable defence of the work of the Brotherhood, "is painted in the open air from the thing itself. Every minute accessory is painted in the same manner." And furthermore, in strict accord with the spirit of romance this principle of naturalism itself becomes in the handling of the Pre-Raphaelites an instrument by which details are invested with a power of imaginative suggestion that removes them at once and entirely from the region of crude realism, and through the smallest and most commonplace accessories bodies forth to the imagination a remote and often a hidden significance. For example, in Hunt's picture of Isabella, the altar-cloth on which rests the pot of basil, wherein her lover's head is casketed, is embroidered with a design of passion-flowers, and every subsidiary object is rendered symbolic of the fantasy of the sorrowing maid.

Precisely these features and elements characteristic of Pre-Raphaelite art appear also as the salient qualities of the earlier poems of Tennyson,—of those in particular that were chosen for illustration by Millais, Hunt, and Rossetti. And that is the reason, doubtless, why they were attracted by them, and were able to interpret and represent them with such insight and sympathy. In the first place there is a group of poems in which the interest lies in romantic and mediæval incident for which each of the artists in his own individual way made appropriate drawings. "Oriana," a variation of the old ballad of "Helen of Kirconnell," excited much enthusiasm, according to FitzGerald, when the young poet read it to the youths that used to gather about him at Cambridge tables. It is the cry of a lover whose arrow, aimed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at a foeman, went aside and pierced the heart of the maiden with whom he had plighted troth before the battle began. "The Sisters" also is a ballad of bitter passion, a revengeful tale of hate and brutal treachery,—thoroughly mediæval in its fierce passions and its fear of hell. "The Beggar Maid" again is Tennyson's retelling of the ballad of "King Cophetua." "The Day Dream," a delightful trifle, a gay and pretty fantasy, prelusive of the art of "The Princess" in its delicate fooling and "earnest wed with sport," is nevertheless of the Middle Ages in the magic spell which held the palace in sleep for a hundred years, and belongs to the days of strange enchantments and faery legend. "Godiva," too, with its grotesque portrait of the rough earl among his dogs,—

> "His beard a foot before him, and his hair
> A yard behind;"

with its Gothic architecture, its pillars and fantastic gables crowding overhead, "its little wide-mouth'd heads upon the spouts" that "grin with cunning eyes to see,"—it all belongs to the times when the imagination was free to sport in caricature and grotesquery of every sort. In many another poem likewise Tennyson thus touches the faery world of far-off times and places.

Finally, crowning the whole series, are his early experiments in Arthurian romance,—"The Lady of Shalott" in particular, with its verbal melody, caught perhaps from Coleridge, its full and splendid elaboration of mediæval picture, with its tower among the lilies, and the lonely maid weaving her web before the mirror, and her song heard by moonlight on the dreary uplands, and her longing for the great world from which she has been shut away, and with its curse and the lady's doom. It is in such a poem as this that one finds, indeed, the elements of the purest and highest romance, the fine presentment in perfect imagery of strange enchantments, the alluring sense of a deeper meaning lurking beneath the image but refusing to be conjured forth, and the weird spell that human emotion throws over the world of nature until its realism is transformed into an ideal beauty more rare than is seen by fleshly eye.

The saintly virtue of virginity, moreover, the practice of the ascetic life even to the point of a perversion of bodily sensibility, in consequence of which hunger and thirst, cold and all bodily pain become pleasurable, the experience of mystical religious rapture, the breathless ecstasies of a mystic union in absolute

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maidenhood with the Heavenly Bridegroom,—all these, so delicately representative of the Catholic monastic temper of the Middle Ages, find their expression in "St. Agnes' Eve," where they are clothed in phrase and image which themselves seem to be but the "shadows of a shadow-world." In "Sir Galahad" again the discipline of chastity and saintliness glows in the conception of the "faithful knight of God," insensible to cold and bitter frost through the mightier transports that move him, attended by day and night everywhere by the mystic presences that wait upon the soul in its quest for unseen realities, and blessed by visions of high import. At times indeed in the portrayal of these raptures the poet passes beyond the realm of material imagery into pure allegory and symbolism, while the world of nature and all material conceptions are refined and spiritualized by the lyric emotion to which he has given utterance.

On the other hand, Tennyson is at one with the Pre-Raphaelites in his love of truth and close adherence to the facts of nature and life. "Mariana" is a poem in point,—each stanza a little picture in verse embodying through objective detail the dejection and love-longing of the forsaken woman who cries out the passion of her life only in the words of the refrain. Here the poet's power in the composition, the selection, and the subordination of his details in accordance with the emotional effect they are to represent and interpret, and his keenness of eye and ear, his conscious fidelity to fact, his sensuous richness so like that of Keats, are qualities that again link his art with that of the Pre-Raphaelites. Twice Millais was inspired to interpret the sentiment of the poem,—once in the painting of 1851, where he represents Mariana rising from her embroidery frame in front of a window of colored glass through which may be seen a sunlit garden beyond, and bending back in weariness with half-shut eyes. Again, with greater emotional intensity and insight, he drew the simple design for the Moxon volume,—the figure of a woman in a wainscoted chamber; she has been gazing through the latticed window at the poplars, and the long level landscape, and the slowly darkening sky, until overburdened by her melancholy she has turned from the light and buried her face in her hands on the window-seat.

Another important group of these earlier poems has to do with the delineation of the common affections through the portrayal of homely incident. In spite of a sentimental weakness which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occasionally betrayed him in dealing with such subjects, Tennyson has produced a number of poems—"Dora," "Locksley Hall," "The Miller's Daughter," and "Edward Gray"—pictures of English home and country life in which with truth and power he has depicted the sacredness of the domestic emotions and of the ties of blood, and which in turn appealed to Millais for graphic representation. In consequence he has drawn some of his best designs by way of illustrating them, designs that surprise and delight by their variety and versatility, and the power they show for assimilating the ideas of the poet without exposing the weakness and sentimentality into which he sometimes falls. The longing for lost love and the bitter regret and self-reproach for unkind words spoken long ago, give a simple pathos to the poem of "Edward Gray," which Millais has depicted with delicate sympathy in the drooping figure, the dejected attitude of the long-absent lover and the gentle kindliness of one who greets him with womanly welcome. There are two pictures for "Dora," drawn by the same hand, and two for "The Day-Dream," both romantic and simple,—one depicting the arrival of the Prince at the enchanted castle, and the other showing the King and his courtiers waking before the table, and the serving-men breaking into noisy life as the spell is snapped by the magic kiss.

But it must not be supposed that the illustrations of Millais were confined to the portrayal of poetic incident, whether homely or romantic. In the design for "Mariana" his sympathetic power to render the spiritual significance of the poet's lines has already been remarked. And this faculty appears again in two other drawings, perhaps the greatest of his contributions to the series. One is the powerfully imaginative design, "The Wind is Blowing in Turret and Tree," drawn for "The Sisters" and singled out for special praise by Ruskin. Here the artist has seized upon and presented in picture all the weird and ghostly horror, the guilt and passion of the tale. A full moon is rolling in the sky, but harassed by driving cloud that dims its light; the tall poplars are bending to the force of the wind; a door in the turret swings back and forth upon the roof; it is in such a place that ghostly shapes might pass up and down the foot-worn stones and back and forth in the shadows. And on the other hand, in his picture of the saintly nun, clad in austere gown of white, pausing on the convent stairs, indifferent to cold, to gaze out upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the snow-covered earth lying white in the moonlight, and to breathe into the frosty air her desire for utter purity, he has given a wonderful representation of the poetic principle of Tennyson's "St. Agnes' Eve," and of the holy maid's ecstatic prayer.

Millais, however, sympathetically interpretative as he is in such designs as these, never transcends the limits of the poet's original conceptions as they are set down for him in the several poems he selected for illustration. It is precisely at this point, however, that the art of Holman Hunt, in its application to the poetry of Tennyson, is most distinctive and individual. For it is the happy fortune of Hunt always to invest whatever poem he made his drawings for with the charm of his own imagination, delicate, romantic, poetic. Memories of his sojourn in Syria and his solitary travels in the romantic East flower out, under the impulse of Tennyson's "Recollections of the Arabian Nights," in two fascinating pictures that embody in graphic form much of the luxury of the poet's elaborate and fanciful lines. One is an imaginary portrait of the "good Haroun Alraschid" himself, of benignant countenance; and the other is a design in which the artist has given truth of local color to the altogether unlocalized, though richly sensuous, details of the poet's series of verbal pictures. Once again for "The Beggar Maid" he disregarded the limitations of exact pictorial delineation—in a way too that called out the poet's sharp protest—and outlined his ideal of the shy and simple beauty of the girl who has won the young King's heart, and the manly vigor of the boy in act of putting his crown on the head of his beggar Queen. For "Godiva" also he drew a sweetly romantic picture, but thoroughly individual,—a Gothic chamber, secret and remote, where before a quaintly carved *prie-dieu,* with the crucifix above it, stands the Lady of Coventry about to unclasp "the wedded eagles of her belt," but looking in dread of an intruder toward the massive doorway and the shadowy corridors, where prying eyes might lurk to spy her naked beauty.

It is in his two designs for "Oriana," however, and in the single perfect drawing for "The Lady of Shalott" that Hunt gives the most distinctive and charming evidence of his power of pictorial interpretation, the finest examples of his art as applied to the poetry of Tennyson. In the designs for "Oriana" he has caught and represented all the deep pathos of the ballad. The first shows the two lovers in the dark yew-wood heedless of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men-at-arms on the distant ramparts preparing for battle, and of the young knight's war-horse that neighs impatience in the nearer background. Everywhere there is suggestion of impending doom. Oriana, whose face is drawn from the familiar features of the artist's wife, bends over her kneeling lover to tie her scarf upon his helmet, and he, steadying its horn beneath her foot, is stringing the fatal bow, so soon, alas! to speed the perfidious arrow to her heart. In the second design the stricken lover kneels again, this time in bitter anguish at the tomb of his slain mistress, amid a winter landscape, to kiss the marble brow of the effigy, while his boat in the background, that is to bear him overseas to other scenes, rises and falls with the heaving tide. In the same way, once more and with deeper insight, he has invested his drawing for "The Lady of Shalott" with a remote and subtle pathos,—the Lady, a perfect figure, stands before her web in the tower; in the mirror before her is shown the passing of Lancelot; the curse has come upon her, the blown hair that is driven in wavy masses about her head and the broken threads from the loom that entwine her with tangled persistence being finely indicative of the fatality that is her doom.

Rossetti also made a drawing for the same poem, and the two are in sharp contrast, each being individual and significant of the imaginative quality of its maker. Hunt's conception belongs to the enchanted regions of faery, unlocalized in time or place, a fine, ideal and perfect presentment of Tennyson's poem, the beautiful woman, and her strange destiny. But Rossetti's is weird and of the Middle Ages in all its details, invested by the artist with all those features that are distinctive of his own imaginative outlook. The Lady lies dead in her boat that floats in the night through Camelot, her head shadowed by a strange roof-like covering on which burn the flickering funeral lights; from the bridge that spans the stream Lancelot descends to muse upon her face, the courtiers crowding behind him in idle curiosity; on the water in the middle distance the awakened and startled swans swim about in wild commotion, and on the far side of the river a rout of midnight revellers pours from the castle doorways to the neighboring wharf.

The same weird mediævalism, the same intense and flaming individuality of treatment appears again in the "Mariana," as it appears in fullest symbolism in the drawing of "St. Cecily"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for "The Palace of Art,"—a picture which Ruskin regarded as the best in the book, except as it had been spoiled in the cutting. Mystical, every detail glowing with imaginative significance, it presents the Saint kneeling in a trance before her organ with lifeless hands resting on the keys, while an angel bends over her to kiss her into life and music; in the crowded background is the rampart of a city, and beyond the harbor with its shipping; and in the foreground is a man-at-arms eating an apple, while a dove—representing, it may be, the escape of the soul from the prison of the flesh—flutters up from the darkness of the dungeon beneath. He drew also for the same poem the strange design of "Arthur Sleeping in Avalon," which the Tennysons liked as well as, if not better than, any in the book. The sorely wounded Arthur lies asleep on the flower-strewn sward, tended by a half-score of weeping Queens,—one of whom has the familiar face of the artist's sister, Christina; anchored upon the stream beyond is the mysterious vessel that had brought him thither, and still further in the background stands a wood-chapel on a wild bleak shore. It is not the Avalon of legend, not yet the softer Avilion of Tennyson that has been portrayed, but a country strange, weird, remote, beheld only of a Rossetti and his kindred with the eye of pure romance. And finally, in the design of "Sir Galahad," the artist has made a picture, simple and impressive to a high degree, to supplement the poem imaginatively as the poem in turn supplements and interprets it. The knight in armor and emblazoned tabard, gleaming white in the altar lights of a rustic chapel in the wild wood, bows before the font of holy water; beneath, and hidden in shadow, a row of holy women part their lips in songs of praise, as one of their number with unseen hands slowly sounds the chapel bell, and in the depths of the dark forest the young knight's war-horse impatiently paws the ground. The face of the worshipping knight is pure and noble, as the glow of the candles flashes upon it, and the whole is a fine and exalted representation of the poet's conception of the virgin knight and his spiritual raptures.

William Emory Smyser.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAPAN'S ABSORPTION OF KOREA.

BY WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

THE experiment of Japan in attempting to amalgamate the Korean and the Japanese people, and to give to the one the constitutional rights and privileges of the other, is of a sort unique in history and is of world-wide interest. If successful, it will eclipse all known peace victories.

Even in our own days there have been manifold causes and not a few occasions of war between the two nations. The typical instance of both was, the official insult of the Government of Korea in 1872, taunting Japan for discarding Chinese civilization and adopting that of Christendom, and in 1876 the firing from a Korean fort upon Japanese sailors. The first opened a breach between the sworded samurai, scarcely yet out of feudalism, and precipitated a cabinet crisis, followed by a civil war in 1877, which cost Japan 20,000 lives and $50,000,000. Then further, for Korea's sake, Japan undertook two continental wars, with China and with Russia.

At the beginning of her modern life, Japan stood first for peace and "the open door." A treaty was made by which Korea received, for the first time, recognition as a sovereign State. Then Japan attempted to redeem Cho-sen, the old "Treasure Land of the West," from mediævalism, with all its cruelties and horrors, and to coax Korea into modern national life. For years Japan lent her best statesmen and lavished her money to aid Korea into freedom and modern life.

None, least of all the Japanese, would call this altruistic benevolence. It was intelligent selfishness, with a strain of profound sympathy springing from racial and cultural roots but little understood by Occidentals. It was for Japan's own safety thus to lift up her neighbor, a cowed and hermit vassal of China.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For, though Japan's own perils from predatory Western nations were great—Russia and Germany having long been distinctly hostile in feeling, while France, in 1868, openly sided with the Tycoon and opposed the Mikado's Government of progress—yet the existence of a next-door neighbor bigotedly attached to the ideals of the ancient world was greater. Even to-day, outweighing all other things necessary for Japan's safety and future progress is that of a reformed China. Her neighbor nations must be in sympathy with modern progressive ideals, for Japan is the middle term between Orient and Occident.

In this view we have the key which unlocks the complicated situation in the Far East. It shows Japan consistent throughout. From the first, in fiercely hostile opposition to her, on her march, abreast with the Anglo-Saxon nations, stood China's claim of universal sovereignty, by virtue of which Korea was her vassal. As a matter of fact, "The Little Outpost State" never had any complete sovereignty until Japan, in 1876, conferred it. Korea is not to-day losing what she never had.

The trend of events leading to the action of August 28th, 1910, may be understood by glancing at the history of the country unfortunately situated between a continental and an insular people—the one venerable with undated time, and the other young, boundlessly energetic, but in Chinese eyes impudent, conceited, and neighbor-disturbing. No love has ever been lost between Japan and China, nor apparently is likely to be. Alliance between them is a dream.

Sentimentalism is not science, nor are boasting and traditional glamour history. It is time for our encyclopædias and popular writers to reform their wretched habit of giving China, Japan, and Korea a written history that antedates that of Egypt or Assyria. China has no annals in writing before 800 B.C., Korea none before A.D. 500, Japan none before 700.

Our Admiral, John Rodgers, was officially informed, in 1870, that "Korea was satisfied with her four thousand years of her civilization" and needed none from the outside. Every nursery in Cho-sen repeats this boast and also the pretty fairy-tale about the ancestor of Confucius coming eastward in 1122 B.C. to civilize the Korean people. He named his new domain Cho-sen, "Dawnland," "Country of the Day Spring," or "Morning Radiance." They even show you Ki-Tsze's tomb at Ping-Yang, and since its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partial demolition during the Chino-Japanese war of 1894 they have repaired it. Instead also of the "twenty" million Koreans boasted of by assassins, the enumeration of 1909 gives 12,363,400 as the native population.

The issues of the long race struggles in early Korea, as in Britain, were three kingdoms, from, or rather through, one of which letters, writing, and the Buddhist religion were brought to Japan A.D. 552. Of these three Shinra became predominant. In A.D. 667 Korea was invaded by the Chinese and made a vassal state. In the tenth century, the united pensinsula was called Korai, a name condensed from the older Kokorai. In 1012 A.D. modern Korea's boundaries were fixed by the loss of Liaotung as the result of war with the Khiban Tartars. Henceforth she possessed no land north of the Yalu River.

When, in 1392, the present kingdom and dynasty were founded, with its capital Han-Yang (Royal Residence on the Han River), or Seoul (stockade or walled enclosure), the ancient name Cho-sen was readopted. The Koreans, like the Europeans and Americans, hark back to ancient names. We have Erin, Caledonia, Albion, Batavia, Germania, Gaul, and so forth, and Americans sing "Hail, Columbia." Nevertheless, American newspapers inform us that Japan has even deprived Korea of her [Frenchy] name and dubbed her Cho-sen. Rather in this is Japanese tact revealed.

Korea has relatively a sparse population of twelve millions within ninety thousand square miles. Her people have had no struggle for food as in China and old Japan. Her soil is as yet hardly more than scratched for her few crops, chiefly millet, turnips, and rice. Her hills are bare and sheep are unknown. Her art is scarcely more than rudimentary. Her literature is chiefly in Chinese or borrowed from China. Coming from China and its monumental lore, or the beauty of æsthetic Japan, the contrast between the great trading nation with its shops or of the panoply and enterprise of the insulars is striking. Some declare the Koreans are degenerate physically, intellectually and morally. Korea's own proverbs mirror her history. Shut up from the world in paralyzing vassalage, Korea's experience is that of "a shrimp between two whales." "Absorption" means opportunity and liberty to progress.

Korea lacked the discipline of the feudal system, which in China was a golden age and in Japan fused many races and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tribes into unity, opening the pathway of promotion to the vigorous, teaching the law of mutual contract and developing a high sense of honor. In Japan, the system flowered in that superb specimen of humanity, the samurai. In Korea, under Chinese force and influence, since 1392, the ruling classes were divided into the Yang and Ban, military and literary. Mountains and seas shut off fertilizing contact with the world. Declining enterprise, hating labor in all its forms, unable or unwilling to be like the Chinese, great traders or cultured knights like the Japanese, the Yang-ban now numbering 400,000, or, with their families, nearly two million, became the leeches on the public treasury and oppressors of the people. Until recently they owned and gripped to its impoverishment the whole country, opposing modern ideas and the new civilization and detesting the Japanese, especially, for the same reason that the *literati* in China hate with unquenchable malignance Christianity and Western civilization, knowing that the entrance of these sounds the doom of their tyranny.

Yet savage Korea had her boons. First and greatest of all these was that one religion which has saved the Far Orientals from intellectual stupor and the paralysis of materialism. Buddhism fertilized the Mongol and Chinese mind and gave rise to its idealism and philosophy, added beauty and charm to the landscape, furnished its people with folklore, popular literature, art and architecture, while blending the best fruits of the Aryan, Hindoo and Chinese intellect. Through the zeal and faith of its missionaries, Korea was given her one brilliant period of national life. Buddhism fused the tribes of the peninsula into unity. It made Korea a nation.

A thousand years of Buddhism meant for the peninsula the praise and joy of life as expressed in art and monuments, shrines and pagodas. After the flames and harrows of many wars and the burdens of tribute from Chinese, Khitan Tartars, Mongols, mediæval Japanese pirates and invaders, Ming emperors and Manchus, Korea is the Issachar of nations. Yet there still stand those colossal figures of white granite, sometimes as large as lighthouses and cut out of the solid rock, sculptured white marble pagodas, edifices of stone for science and religion, moss-grown tumuli and ruins of monasteries and cities, their chiselled and carven work overgrown with weeds. These tell of a glorious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

garden of faith at which Occidentals may sneer, but at which those who know the vast consolations of Buddhism, its uplifting ideals, its doctrines of tender compassion, its devotion to art, its power to kindle the imagination and to lighten the burdens of woe and care, will never disdain, but will rather, in any analysis of history, rightly appraise.

Yet like so many religions, Christianity being no exception, when luxury supplants sacrifice, priestcraft dominates over missionary zeal, and intrigue and lust of power take the place of ministry to the poor, there result dry-rot from within or destruction from without. In 1392—to condense much history into a sentence—the old dynasty favorable to the faith of India was overthrown. Buddhism was banned and its priests forbidden to enter walled cities. Only in mountains and secluded districts were the monasteries allowed to exist on condition of public use as strongholds when necessary, in war the clerics and their followers forming a sort of militia. For monk and nun during centuries the status was that of virtual beggary.

The new dynasty of 1392 installed Chinese ritual and dogmas. Whatever be the undoubted ethical virtues of Confucianism as a system, it is better fitted for intellectual men above the average. Apart from the regulation of conduct, it does little for the people, for it lacks the human tenderness of Buddhism. It gives no hope or aspiration, leaving imagination infertile or the prey to that animism and beast worship which underly all Asiatic religion, while it distinctly degrades woman. In no land has her condition been more hopeless than in Korea. There is nothing in Confucianism to welcome progress. It means subordination, government and order, but never advance or aspiration. Hard as it may be for Occidentals, who take their opinions about Far-Eastern movements from newspapers, to recognize the fact, Confucianism is the mainspring of Chinese as it was of old Japanese and Korean politics.

In 1866 the direct line of Cho-sen having come to an end when three royal widows were living, a boy twelve years old was made heir apparent. He became the Emperor who was deposed in 1907. In 1866 also men of five nationalities landed on Korean soil to rob, kill, trade or make treaties—all equally heinous in the eyes of the hermits.

During this period of hermitage, from 1392, Korea built a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

barrier of stakes in Manchuria and desolated her frontiers to keep out the foreigners who came in ships. She possessed no system of public law or apparatus of justice, permitted a system of cruelty and punishment worse even than China's, and neglected the development of the country's resources. At the capital, Government meant family feuds and the privileged classes in ease living on the farmers and common people. Public hygiene was unknown. Until the missionaries came, in 1882, the diseased, the aged and the lying-in women were in large numbers put out in the fields or on the grassy slopes of the city walls, with a jar of water and a bowl of rice to take their chances. The masses were left in superstition to become the prey of the geomancer and sorcerer, who, to the number of tens of thousands, have been the actual governors of both the palace and the masses. The upper and student classes became hardened in that form of bigotry which Confucianism is so prolific in producing, its Korean crust of intolerance being even more indurated than in its native home. Hence when Japan definitely turned her face away from China to accept Western civilization, Korean official wrath was roused, and the Japanese of 1868 were stung to madness by an insulting letter calling them traitors to Eastern culture.

Once having recognized Cho-sen as an independent State, Japan instantly came into collision with China's dogma of universal sovereignty, which students of Far-Eastern affairs even then saw must be buried in the same grave with the divine right of kings and other defunct theories, if there was to be any peace in the Orient or decent intercourse between East and West. When Korea would send an embassy to Washington to ratify the treaty, the Peking mandarins left no means untried to prevent its departure, even to kidnapping one of the envoys, but the U.S.S.S. "Trenton" brought the Koreans to America and back. The United States paid the expenses of the embassy, but later in Washington drew the line at boarding a whole legation.

After her partisans had stirred up the Korean mob to fire their Legation, leaving the Japanese dead unburied on the street, China, to vindicate her dogma of universal sovereignty, sent three thousand troops under Yuan Shi Kwai and two other generals to "preserve order," which meant the virtual annexing of Korea by placing the country under her customs service. After the *coup d'état* of envoys returned from America, who attempted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to hatch the egg of reform by incubating it in the fires of assassination and incendiarism, the little Japanese Legation guard was driven out of Seoul by overwhelming numbers of Chinese troops, their dead being left for the dogs again. China kept as her Resident, after the British fashion in India, the same Yuan who for years virtually dictated the policy of the Korean Government.

When Li Hung Chang and Marquis Ito made an agreement to withdraw the soldiery of both countries and never send troops without first notifying the other, then China once more showed that her sense of a written recognition of Korean independence in the treaty was purely Pickwickian. At the first new symptom of chronic anarchy in the southern provinces the pro-Chinese party at the Seoul Court asked Peking for aid. Then China tore up the treaty with Japan into strips, making double violation, by first sending a strong body of soldiers before notifying Japan, and, secondly, openly naming in the belated document Korea as "our vassal." In the war declaration from Tokio, in the modern way, and from China, couched in mediæval phraseology, the old dogma of universal sovereignty was again flaunted and the soldiers were told to "root the Wo-jin [Japanese dwarfs] out of their lairs."

The Chino-Japanese war made Korea free and independent. The first thing the people of Seoul did was to obliterate the monuments of their degradation by conquest. When, in 1638, the rough riders, the "horsey Tartars," rode out from Manchurian valleys to conquer China and make three hundred millions of people shave their foreheads and plait the pigtail, they excused the Koreans from wearing the queue, because of their ready submission, and the chignons were kept. In 1894, proud of their freedom given them by the Japanese, they overthrew the tablet erected where their king had signed the treaty acknowledging Manchu sovereignty and pulled down the Arch of Welcome at the Chinese Gate near the Peking Pass, to which their sovereign always came to meet and do obeisance to the envoy from China's Emperor. In its place they reared the Independence Arch, an American teacher serving as architect, organized an Independence Club and talked grandly of great reforms and of freedom—which had no long training in self-control behind it.

In the decade that followed, the Americans were the leaders

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the development of Korea's resources, material and spiritual, while Russia's real purpose was shown chiefly in increase of her military Legation guard and possession of frontier concessions and privileges. The Emperor, always the incarnation of timidity, was thrown into the shade, or made a puppet, by his wife Queen Min, a woman of notable ability, who steadily neutralized the reforms which Count Inouye "the white flower of Japanese statesmanship" was attempting, in nominal conjunction with the King, to inaugurate. Indeed, actual government in Seoul issued not from a council of statesmen, but from a vast *boudoir* of wives, concubines, fortune-tellers and sorceresses. Court and Government were not separated. The Tai Won Kun, or Prince Palace Father, a man of unscrupulous vigor, who had lost nominal power when ceasing to be regent, so heartily hated the Queen—she being of a rival clan—that he left no gunpowder unburned or dynamite unexploded to secure her cremation or evaporation. The plots of this decade, within and without the palace, surpass in weird horror anything in the "Arabian Nights" stories. Villainous Japanese and low Koreans were incited by the Prince Father, and the fate of the Queen was murder and incineration. The King fled to the Russian Legation. There he lived a year, fulminating against the former ministers, while Russian prestige increased, and the timber concessions on the Yalu fattened syndicates in St. Petersburg and brought Russian wood-cutters and their Cossack guards on Korean soil. Returning to his palace, the King announced his intention to become "Emperor," and on October 12th, 1897, at daybreak, went through the ceremonies. Later he promulgated a so-called constitution of nine articles, centralizing all power in himself. The document is incredible in its absurdity. It aimed at suppressing the struggles of the people for more freedom and the abolition of oppressive old customs.

The leaven brought by the Westerners was acting, but of the public money lavished on industrial enterprises, very little was ever applied to the desired objects. The official report of the Decoration Bureau and Factory belongs to the horse-play of history. Universal graft was ancient and chronic. Scarcely one-half of the local taxes throughout the country ever reached the Imperial treasury. What is actually visible to-day in the way of improvement is the result of private enterprise or Japanese initiation.

When the issue of 1904-05 with Russia had been settled and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question of Korea's reform came up, the choice of the one able to attempt the mighty task, unique in history, fell naturally upon the man who incarnated the New Japan. Yet to those who, like the writer, knew Ito intimately, it seemed almost incredible that a man in his state of health, suffering from *angina pectoris,* instead of seeking rest after a lifetime's extraordinary toil, should take up herculean labors and face certain assassination. Yet, summoning his best energies, he resolved to make it his life's ambition to redeem Korea and give her people the same service he had given so long and loyally to Japan. From his arrival in Seoul, he was a terror to the brutal ruffians, scalawags and lewd fellows of which Japan has too many. In public speeches and in action, both consistent and persistent, he showed even-handed justice. Not at all popular with the military jingoes at home, nor his greedy countrymen in Korea, he patiently mastered details and began intensely practical education, reform and reconstruction, while Japan at his call poured out millions from her treasury.

To-day Terauchi is to build the superstructure upon foundations already laid. In Japan's history, "Satsuma for war and Choshiu for statesmanship." Terauchi, educated in Europe, though War Minister, vice-chief of the General Staff, was born in 1852 in Choshiu and is a man of imperturbable good-humor and sympathy. The work actually done since 1906, and now expanding for the Koreans, who came under the same constitutional rights of freedom, privilege in all things, opportunity of service and promotion as do Japanese, is educational, sanitary, economic, administrative and legal.

No nation on earth excels Japan in proving that "education is the cheap defence of nations." Japan has given Korea, where there was no public provision for education, a system of manual training, common and high schools, and commercial, industrial, agricultural and medical colleges, having already appropriated over $250,000. In the Industrial Training Institute at Seoul six lines of modern technical training, from weaving to engineering, are established. Where public hygiene was unknown, one-half of the people dying of smallpox and syphilis being almost omnipresent, Japan has introduced water-works, hospitals and other means of preserving life, her appropriation to date rising above $6,000,000. In communications, besides a railroad traversing the entire country, with branches planned, and soon to con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nect with the systems of China and Russia, wagon-roads are built or contracted for at a cost thus far of $750,000. Where there were only iron and brass cash, or private minting, Japan has adopted for Korea the gold standard, encouraging also the circulation of bank-notes and the establishment of industrial and agricultural banks. The head of the new Department of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry is appointed directly by the Emperor of Japan. The model farm or experiment station is making, for the first time in Korea, a study and application of seeds, crops and fertilizers, to test the ability of the peninsula, not only to raise cotton, but other staples, thus far unknown. The Forestry School has established three model forests, providing for this purpose $145,000 and three more are to be started and denuded Korea will be reforested. The new mining laws render the rights of operators certain and secure. Korea yields annually $3,000,000 worth of gold, silver, copper, graphite and coal. The centre of graft and rottenness, the Imperial Court, made up largely of eunuchs, sorceresses, geomancers and fortune-tellers, has been cleansed. Instead of the thousands inside the vast enclosure, who governed or sold appointments, administration is now carried on by trained men. The local and national police force has been reorganized. Civil-service examinations have been established in place of the sales of provincial offices.

Nowhere has reform been needed more than in the judiciary, which was formerly controlled by the administration, executive officials acting as judges. Under Ito there was established a system of regular courts and an independent judiciary, which are steadily rooting themselves in Korean routine, so as to become part of the life of the people.

In all their constructive work, the Japanese, who are among the most intensely practical people in the world, have studied conditions rather than enforced theories. Led by Ito, whose spirit still lives, the rapidity and character of their administrative reforms are gauged to fit the experiences of the Korean people.

Japan's problem is much like ours with the Philippines. Let aloofness rule and selfishness triumph and Japan will have an Ireland on her hands as certainly as will America. With altruism, justice and sympathy, she will give the world even greater surprises than thus far enjoyed. She must expect to spend at least $15,000,000 annually for years to come.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Below the political ocean's surface, however troubled, are the great deep currents of common ethnic origins, of language—the tongues of the two countries being more alike than any other two—the great historic faith of Buddhism and the ethics of Confucius held in brotherhood, and, in faith, the sure triumphs of the truth of Jesus. Already there are, by the official census, 250,144 Korean Christians and some thousands of Japanese in Korea, among them several officers of high rank of like belief. "The three t's of the lover — opportunity, importunity and propinquity"—the determination of the Japanese to succeed, the benefits mutually shared by both peoples on the threshold of the wide open door into promising Manchuria, the record of the past in Japan, the temper of the real people of Korea, who, delivered from their hopelessly rotten government, are now given a chance to rise, show signs of promise that the union of the two nations in heart and hand will, in spite of obstacles, difficulties and hindrances from without and within, be accomplished.

Let Japan use the true leaven and the transformation will be consummated without shattering the vessel. The rise of a great double star on the political firmament will be the source of good influences for the blessing of mankind. Out of forty-five years of experience with and study of the Japanese, I utter my faith in their success.

As for American interests, they are safe. Japan has a genius for disappointing the croakers and silencing the prophets of calamity. A hundred times has she done that since 1868. Remembering nearly fifty years of prognostications of the evils that were to come when consular courts and extra-territoriality were abolished, but which never happened, the steady storm of criticism, the abominable and slanderous misrepresentations by the war-makers in our own country, while painfully conscious of the crying need of the study of Far-Eastern history in our American schools and universities, rather than from telegram and newspapers printed overnight, I believe that Japan, the unquailing exponent of modern civilization in Asia and the true middle term between Orient and Occident, will keep faith and do justice, not only with the nations at large, but with that country which she has ever recognized as her first, her best and her truest friend—the United States of America.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

YOUR INCOME.

THE INCREASED PRODUCTION OF GOLD, THE RISE IN COMMODITIES, AND ITS BEARING UPON THE INVESTMENT OF SAVINGS.

BY CHARLES BLAIR MACDONALD.

A CAREFUL and thrifty citizen who had saved $10,000 in 1897 placed it in a savings-bank, the bank promising him four per cent. interest per annum. Ten years later the depositor drew out the $10,000 and, looking for an investment, realized that he had lost more than the forty per cent. interest he had received during the ten years, owing to the fact that the average advance in everything his $10,000 would buy had been about fifty per cent. In other words, he realized that he had received no return whatever on his money during this period. Why? he asks, and is told: since the demonetization of silver, gold as a measure of value and medium of exchange has depreciated forty to fifty per cent., the depreciation being directly attributable to the increased supply. Again, asking what proof there is of this, he is told that prices tend to rise or fall in direct ratio to the quantity or volume of the medium of exchange by which they are measured. This is known *crudely* as the "Quantitative Theory of Money."

Seligman, in his "Principles of Economics," points out that while this statement of the Quantitative Theory of money is not exact in its application, it is mainly true and means that "in the absence of relative changes in the other factors a variation of the quantity of money will produce a change in the price level." Experience has proved the truth of this. It is established by history and by statistics beyond cavil. The other factors which influence prices besides the depreciation of the medium of exchange are various—tariffs, credits, inventions, supplies from new lands, failure of crops, efficiency of labor, earthquakes, fires,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cheaper transportation, general production, etc., etc. These varied influences at times render the relation of price movements to the volume of exchange one of complexity.

Slowly the investing public is awakening to an understanding that their yearly income derived from investments is more than lost so long as gold depreciates in value to the amount of the interest received. Or, to put it in another form, when that which money can buy rises more than the interest received. Consequently, the question of how to invest one's savings is becoming more vitally interesting to the entire community.

Knowing the yearly production of gold and silver, one can readily compare its volume with the average price movements of commodities by making a study of the various price levels in England, Germany and the United States.

First. Dr. Soetbeer's Index number of prices at Hamburg, based upon the average relative prices of one hundred Hamburg commodities and fourteen manufactured articles of British export.

Second. Mr. Saurbeck's Index number based upon fifty-six commodities in London.

Third. The London "Economist's" Index number of twenty-two wholesale commodities.

Fourth. The United States Senate Finance Committee's Index number of commodity prices in the United States, known as the Aldrich report, based upon 230 commodities.

Fifth. Dun's Index number of 350 American commodities.

Sixth. The United States Department of Commerce and Labor's Index number based upon 250 commodities in the United States.

Seventh. Bradstreet's Index number based upon ninety-six commodities.

The numbers in the following tabulation are not in their original form. Mr. Wesley Steele, of the Financial Graphic Service, has been good enough to reduce the original index numbers to a hundred-per-cent. level, according to the terms of 1851. As for the three index numbers of United States prices which begin later than 1851, each is given the value of the Aldrich report number in the year in which it begins, reducing the prices in subsequent years to correspond. By this method the reader can see at a glance the fluctuations in prices.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1851.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
1852.....	101.5	104.0	——	99.3			
1853.....	113.5	126.7	——	106.5			
1854.....	121.0	136.0	——	106.5			
1855.....	124.0	134.7	——	110.8			
1856.....	123.0	134.7	——	113.9			
1857.....	129.8	140.0	——	115.6			
1858.....	113.3	121.3	113.9	114.8			
1859.....	116.1	125.3	——	104.4			
1860.....	120.7	132.0	——	101.4	101.4		
1861.....	117.9	130.7	118.9	95.4	94.2		
1862.....	122.4	134.7	125.5	103.0	95.3		
1863.....	125.2	137.3	152.3	92.4	102.3		
1864.....	129.0	140.0	165.1	112.3	104.6		
1865.....	122.4	134.7	155.9	108.9	124.8		
1866.....	125.6	136.0	155.4	135.9	125.2		
1867.....	124.2	133.3	131.9	125.0	119.2		
1868.....	121.7	132.0	117.0	127.4	114.3		
1869.....	123.1	130.7	116.3	113.9	108.9		
1870.....	122.6	128.0	117.3	120.7	116.3		
1871.....	126.8	133.3	113.0	124.6	117.3		
1872.....	135.3	145.3	123.6	123.1	117.1		
1873.....	138.0	148.0	128.5	116.1	111.1		
1874.....	135.9	136.0	126.1	118.3	110.2		
1875.....	129.6	128.0	121.1	116.2	101.0		
1876.....	128.1	126.7	118.2	110.2	92.2		
1877.....	122.4	125.3	118.4	108.5	95.0		
1878.....	120.3	116.0	110.3	104.7	85.5		
1879.....	116.9	110.7	97.0	96.4	85.2		
1880.....	121.6	117.3	110.7	106.4	97.9		
1881.....	120.8	113.3	103.6	109.9	99.2		
1882.....	121.9	112.0	106.2	110.7	105.8		
1883.....	122.0	109.3	102.1	108.1	95.8		
1884.....	114.0	101.3	96.9	104.1	87.6		
1885.....	108.5	96.0	91.5	94.6	80.4		
1886.....	103.8	92.0	88.2	94.7	79.1		
1887.....	101.8	90.7	89.8	95.8	82.4		
1888.....	101.8	93.3	97.3	97.6	84.1		
1889.....	105.9	96.0	95.4	99.9	78.6		
1890.....	107.9	96.0	97.5	95.0	80.6	95.0	
1891.....	109.0	96.0	97.7	95.7	84.6	94.0	
1892.....	——	90.7	93.0	——	77.8	89.3	89.3
1893.....	——	90.7	92.4	——	79.4	88.9	86.5
1894.....	——	84.0	86.7	——	71.7	80.9	76.8
1895.....	——	82.7	85.3	——	70.5	78.8	73.9
1896.....	——	81.3	85.7	——	65.6	76.1	67.9
1897.....	——	82.7	83.3	——	64.4	75.5	70.2
1898.....	——	85.3	82.9	——	68.0	78.6	75.5
1899.....	——	90.7	88.5	——	74.1	85.6	82.8
1900.....	——	100.0	96.2	——	80.2	93.0	90.5
1901.....	——	93.3	87.7	——	82.1	91.3	87.0
1902.....	——	92.0	86.7	——	86.0	95.0	90.4
1903.....	——	92.0	91.9	——	84.9	95.6	91.1
1904.....	——	93.3	94.7	——	85.9	95.1	90.9
1905.....	——	96.0	95.8	——	86.2	97.5	93.0
1906.....	——	102.7	103.5	——	90.3	103.1	96.7
1907.....	——	106.7	108.7	——	92.8	109.0	102.3
1908.....	——	——	96.5	——	——	——	92.0
1909.....	——	——	97.9	——	——	——	97.8

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Confining ourselves to following the volume of the medium of exchange since the discovery of gold in California in 1847,* the reader, by our chart of commodity prices, is at once struck with the similarity of price movements as indicated by the various authorities, taking as they do different prices in different countries. For instance, all show the high prices of 1857, 1864, 1873 and 1907, and particularly do they accentuate the low prices of 1896. The high prices of 1857 were undoubtedly due to the increased gold production resulting from the discovery of gold in California in 1847 and Australia in 1851. The gold production for ten years, 1851 to 1860, inclusive, was by far the greatest in the world's history up to that time. This decade produced $1,332,000,000 gold, as against $1,262,000,000 gold for one hundred years previous, namely, 1741 to 1840. This caused general optimism and expansion based upon easy money, resulting in overcommitments, national and personal extravagances, and a final collapse in 1857. After 1857 the supply of the circulating medium still continued large and started the waves of prosperity again, just as the continued increase in the gold output has caused a rapid recovery from the panic of 1907.

After 1857 we come to many cross-currents, including the Civil War of 1861 and the Franco-German War in 1870. During this period there was no great increase in the combined production of the precious metals. During the fifties they averaged $171,000,000 annual total value, while in the sixties they averaged $175,000,000. Comparing this with an annual average of $68,000,000 in the forties and $28,000,000 in the thirties, we have abundant evidence of the increase. This enormous increase was accompanied by a corresponding rise in commodity prices. The impetus given by the increase in the circulating medium of ex-

* A brief historical account of the production of the precious metals, gold and silver, up to the commencement of the demonetization of silver in 1873 will be illuminating.

From 1550 to 1850 there were only two cycles of severe fluctuations in prices. In the middle of the sixteenth century there were large discoveries of silver in South America and Mexico. Prices at that period expanded 200 to 300 per cent., advancing gradually. This period is generally known as the famous "Revolution of Prices." From that time on until the discovery of gold in California and Australia in the middle of the nineteenth century there was no great variation in the production of the precious metals except from 1790 to 1810, when the silver production increased about fifty per cent.; prices then advanced seventy to eighty per cent. Later, with the falling off of the production of both gold and silver, after 1810 prices lost the entire advance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change caused prices to rise until 1873, when optimism and inflation caused great speculation, again resulting in a panic, that of 1873.

From now on until 1896 comes what many people call "The Tragedy of Commerce"—namely, the demonetization of silver. Debtors were obliged to pay in the appreciating metal, gold, instead of gold or silver on the basis of fifteen and one-half to one as contracted. In 1871 Germany received five milliard francs, or $1,000,000,000, in gold from France, and in 1872 announced the closing of her mints to the free coinage of silver, and in the following six years marketed some $200,000,000 of silver coin, thereby going to a gold basis. Silver production continued to increase, there being in the forties $25,000,000 annual average currency value in dollars, while in the nineties there was $210,000,000. In 1875 the Latin Union definitely abrogated the coinage of five-franc silver pieces.

It is not necessary to follow the history of the demonetization of silver in further detail. It is sufficient to say that from 1871 country after country throughout the civilized world closed its mints to silver, thereby demonetizing over $3,000,000,000 of silver, exclusive of subsidiary coinage, or more than fifty per cent. of the circulating medium of the world at that time. This, together with the decreased gold-supply, caused the unparalleled fall in the price of commodities from 1873 to 1896, when the United States passed to a gold basis. Curiously enough, in 1893, only three years before 1896, the gold production broke the record of 1853 and has continued to increase until the record-breaking return of $457,000,000 in 1909, *accompanied by record-breaking commodity prices.*

The temporary falling off of commodity prices in 1858 and 1908 can be directly attributed to overproduction and the panics preceding those years.

One now asks what the end will be.

To bring the truth of the Quantitative Theory of Money more forcibly to our minds, let us assume, *reductio ad absurdum,* that we suddenly found a mountain of pure gold and that the production of gold was assured for years to be as plentiful as the production of copper, say 18,000,000,000 ounces instead of 20,000,000 ounces—that is, a production nine hundred times the present output. Assuming the mints of the world remained open

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to free coinage as now, one can readily comprehend that bonds, notes and other obligations, payable at a fixed date in gold, would practically have to be given away, while property and securities *which carry an equity* would sell at many hundred times their present prices. While to-day the increased production of gold is only sufficient to advance values fractionally, for the reason that the increase yearly in the volume of gold is but fractional, we know fractions in time will make a formidable numeral.

In the decade of the eighties the total value of gold produced was $1,068,500,000. From this we must deduct $625,000,000 which was consumed in the arts (Dr. Soetbeer is authority for the statement that $62,500,000 is used in the arts yearly. This the Royal Commission accepted as practically correct). Deducting this, we have $443,500,000 out of the ten years' production available for money purposes.

In 1909 the total gold production was $457,000,000. Deducting from this $62,500,000 leaves $394,500,000 as the production of gold available for money purposes, almost equal to the ten-year period of the eighties. This comparison brings home to us the immensity of the present production.

The demonetization of one-half the world's money during the last thirty years of the nineteenth century occasioned an extraordinary demand for gold as a basis for currency and for "war chests." Had it not been for this demonetizing of fifty per cent. of the world's circulating medium of exchange, the enormous production of gold would have caused a far greater advance in commodities than we have witnessed. As it was, this demonetization caused a vacuum in the circulating medium. This was partially filled by improved credit arrangements on the part of the banking fraternity, and made easy of accomplishment by means of quicker transportation, cable communication and telephones. The rest had to be made up from the increased gold production. An eminent mining engineer, commenting on this subject, said he was inclined to believe the demand for gold as a basis of currency and "war chests" was now fairly satisfied, and even though the production of gold was not increased but merely maintained at the present volume, it would be felt more in the immediate future than it has been in the past. As to the production of gold in the future, there is every prospect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a continued increase. The production is likely to be halted only through the increased *cost* of production—that is, the cost of mining owing to the depreciation of gold itself.

Now, to come back to our thrifty citizen. Once imbued with the truth that prices rise with the increased production of gold, the question of the output of gold becomes a most serious one, not alone to him, the individual, but to our Government and to all Governments in the administration of their finances. For instance, what is our State Government going to do with the law which prohibits savings-banks, trustees, etc., investing in equities and directs investments in bonds alone? This law, which was meant as a protection to the public, is really proving a hardship. How about the two-cent railway passenger law in many States? How about taxing the unearned increment, as the new Budget in England proposes doing and as we threaten to do in this country? With rising prices fixed obligations payable at a certain date give the investor practically no return on his money. Equities alone will give one the increase his capital is entitled to.

To give a concrete example of equities, let us assume one thrifty citizen invests his $10,000 of savings in Reading bonds, paying four per cent., due in twenty years. Another buys $10,000 worth of Reading stock at 150, which pays him on the investment four per cent. Assuming gold continues to increase in the coming twenty years as it has in the past ten years, what would probably be the result? The production during the last ten years was seventy-five per cent. more than in the previous ten years. If this rate of increase is kept up, the production for the next twenty years will amount to $17,000,000,000, about $4,000,000,000 more than the total amount of gold produced since the discovery of America, and more than three times the monetary stock of gold of the entire world to-day. In this event there can be no doubt that real property and commodities would at least treble in value. The investor who bought the bonds would have received in the twenty years eighty per cent. interest, but with his $10,000, plus his $8,000 interest, he could only buy one-third of that which he could have bought at the time of his initial investment. In other words, in terms of relative values he has lost money.

Now to come to the investor who bought the stock. He buys real property. Rails, ties, equipment and land must also have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trebled in value, as well as all the tangible property of the Reading road (among other things, the road owns forty-two per cent. of the anthracite coal lines in the United States). Coal must advance proportionately with everything else, rendering possible enormous dividends on the stock, conceivably causing Reading stock to more than treble in value; consequently, the investor in buying Reading stock would benefit by the equities, namely, by the increased value of coal, the increased value of iron and the increased value of land and timber. Besides this, he would have his increased interest payments during the twenty years.

On the point of interest rates there is much confusion. Some writers contend that the rise in interest rates will compensate one for the risk taken. Let us see what the authorities state and what the statistical records demonstrate.

While some students contend that interest rates rise, others contend that an increase or decrease in the medium of exchange has nothing whatever to do with the interest rates over a long period of time. Mill, in his "Principles of Political Economy," states:

> "It is evident that the rate of interest bears no necessary relation to the quantity or value of the money in circulation. An increase in the currency has in itself no effect and is incapable of having any effect on the rate of interest. A paper currency issued by the Government in payment of its ordinary expenses, in however great excess it may be issued, would not affect interest in any manner whatsoever. It diminishes the power of money to buy commodities, but not the power of money to buy money."

As Mill does not divide money into fixed capital and equities, I am inclined to take his view as to interest rates in general. As gold is a commodity, it must obey the general law of supply and demand, and that law alone governs its interest rate. If one confines himself to interest rates on bonds or loans payable at a distant date, it must be evident that a person who believes in the Quantitative Theory of Money, and also believes that the gold production will increase, will naturally not buy bonds, but will buy equities. Therefore, people who desire to issue bonds must pay an increased rate of interest to get their money so as to compensate an investor for taking the risk of an increased production of gold and consequent rise in prices.

In looking back upon the discount rate of the Bank of England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you will find from 1780 to 1840 the bank rate was never below four per cent. nor above five per cent. The average discount rate in the eighties was 3.48 per cent., which we have shown was the period when the gold production decreased and silver was in the throes of demonetization. In the nineties the rate was 3.04 per cent. From 1900 to date the bank rate has averaged 4.05 per cent. for the period of the greatest production of gold in the world's history. Considering that the Bank of England rate is based on a free market for gold, an advance of .60 per cent. in twenty years can be attributed to a variety of causes and in no sense can be attributed to an increase of the circulating medium. However, it is different with bonds. Mr. C. C. McCann, in a very able article in the "Political Science Quarterly," on the readjustment of railroad rates, shows a definite rise in the average rate of interest paid by the railroads of this country from 1897 to 1900. During this period the railroads borrowed $5,466,340,000, pretty evenly distributed over the various years. During that period the rate increased from 3.77 per cent. in 1898 gradually to a rate of 5.04 per cent. This increase refers almost entirely, of course, to bonds and notes.

English Consols have declined from 112 in 1897 to 82 in 1910, which is an important argument in favor of those who believe that interest rates increase on bonds with the increase in the circulating medium. So far as I can see, the thrifty citizen can get very little comfort out of the increased rates on bonds.

In the writer's opinion, one must come to the conclusion that so long as gold continues to increase in production as it has in the past ten years, one cannot get away from deciding that the best chance of a return on his capital is an investment in equities—that is to say, he must place his money where the investment will carry the equity with it.

It is a most serious question and ought to be treated by our National Government; otherwise, at the rate of increase of the gold production, it will not be long before the principal countries of the world will appoint Monetary Commissions to deal with the question of gold as they were obliged to deal with the silver question.

CHARLES BLAIR MACDONALD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXERCISE AND REST.*

BY DR. LUTHER HALSEY GULICK.

How many of you that are reading this page have started, at some time or other, a systematic course in walking, dumb-bells, Indian clubs, or some other form of exercise? Most of you, I am sure. But how many of you have kept it up? Comparatively few I am reasonably certain. Here lies the real difficulty in connection with our present ideas of exercise. It is not a difficulty relative to knowledge; for in these days we all know what we should do. It is a difficulty relative to desire.

Not because my experience with regard to this matter is peculiar, but because I imagine you will smile in finding out how like it is to your own, I venture to give it. It has been my professional business for over twenty-five years to promote physical exercise and recreation. As soon as the emphasis in my work changed from the actual teaching of physical exercises to executive management, I dropped all formal exercising, and took only that exercise which pleased me—as most people do. During the summer I camped out and swam and boated. During the winter I started many times with dumb-bells and Indian clubs, to exercise faithfully in my room for ten or fifteen minutes each day. But I never kept it up. I have asked hundreds of people as to their experience in this matter. Almost all have praised the theoretical idea of daily exercises in one's room—and have confessed to not practising their own preaching. Most have started at some time or other on a course of muscular exercise which would keep the body active and vigorous, but have not kept it up.

This same condition exists among those like myself whose business it was to teach muscular exercises. Few teachers of physical training, after changing their work from the actual teaching of muscular exercises to some other line of work, maintain the two

* Address delivered at the Academy of Medicine, New York, 1910.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hours, or anything like it, of muscular work which it is the custom to advise. Clearly there is a gap between knowledge and practice. How may we bridge this gap?

Added information about the effect of exercise on the circulation, the digestion, the vasomotor system, the feelings, the emotional life, is not needed. It is motive power which shall lead us to actually do what we already know to be good, that is needed. In other words, how shall we create the desire to do that which we know we should do? This is the universal gap between knowing and doing, which must be bridged. The solution proposed to-day is—socialize our efforts, act as communities. "Custom and Wont," "Community-habit," "Fashion"—all must take hold of these matters, or we shall remain in our present condition—doing these things spasmodically and irregularly, or not at all.

When it becomes fashionable, when it becomes good breeding, good form, to be well, then and not till then, will this result be accomplished. Nor is this a far-distant event. Our own generation has seen an awakening in matters of health such as was never dreamed of before. Personal and civic cleanliness is a modern invention. London, not so very long ago, had only dirt, rush-covered floors in most of its houses. The scraps from the table were thrown on the floor for the cats and dogs. When the rushes got too deep and conditions were too bad, the whole mass was swept out into the street, which served as the dump for all garbage and sewage of all the families of the city. And this in London! The city which does that to-day—but there are no civilized cities which do that to-day. Conditions are so different to-day that the city with even bad water is in an apologetic state. When in one year, by the installation of sand filters, Pittsburg cut down the deaths from typhoid from over 500 to practically none, we see the power of public opinion.

Public opinion has changed in other ways. It is no longer well-bred to even talk about ill-health. We are still hindered with relics of the days when one's health and ills were the most interesting topic of conversation. We still say, "How do you do?" But woe to the person who really answers that question! The person who habitually pours out upon the unwilling ears of her friends the disagreeable tale of backaches, worries, and other ills—which we all have from day to day—is slowly but surely isolated by the bar of social exclusion. We know that the psychic con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tagion which one person can spread by suggestions with reference to disease, is as real as the contagion from measles, or mumps, or scarlet fever. A little red contagious-disease card might justly and wisely be attached to the door of a person with a "grouch," with just as much reason as if that person had scarlet fever.

Modern society has recognized this psychic contagion, and is demanding that our conversation shall be clean, wholesome, on subjects of health. It is now ill-bred unnecessarily to speak of any pathological subject. This is an epoch-making change in the character of human conversation. And it has occurred within the memory of many of us. This changed attitude of public opinion is the first step toward bridging the gap between knowledge and desire.

If one so desires, it is simple enough to keep one's muscular system in good order by a few simple exercises each day. But merely to keep the muscles hard is not an achievement of much value from the standpoint of health and vigor. It is worth while to keep them just wholesomely supple, as they are in a person who does a reasonable amount of walking, or running, or swimming, or paddling. But to put in one's time and take those exercises which harden up the muscles is well-nigh worthless from the standpoint of health. It may be worth while from the standpoint of personal beauty and pride, but that is all. It does not increase our power of digestion, improve circulation or respiration; nor does it increase the depth or length of our sleep. It certainly does not increase the length of our life; it does not alter the health conditions associated with old age; nor does it increase blood pressure. In fact, the development of massive, hard muscles is positively undesirable. People who think they do not need outdoor air, do not need mental relaxation—who think they can work all their waking hours—who think they can do these things with impunity so long as they keep their muscles hard by a little exercise each day—these people are fundamentally and seriously deceiving themselves.

The kind of muscular exercise which works for health, for good digestion, for vigorous, useful life, for longevity, is the frequent contraction of the large muscles of the body, especially in connection with some pleasurable pursuit. It seems as curious to exercise for health as it is to eat for health. What a pathetic thing, to drag one's self from a book in a comfortable corner, to go out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and walk alone, for health! We must devise ways of doing these things together. We must establish social customs relative to spending week-ends, to going out afternoons for games, walks and the like, before we can accomplish the right kind of even muscular exercise. Exercise is not a thing to be taken like a pill—it cannot be picked out of and put into life like a block—it is a part of a whole, it must be associated with our social relations. Just as the flow of the gastric juices and good digestion are aided by waiting on hunger and inhaling the stimulating odors of the meal; just as these things belong to the normal process of digestion, and just as good digestion is difficult without them; so it is with recreation. It is to be associated with social life, with outdoors, with something that is interesting. It is hopelessly ineffectual if we put it by itself, and make of it merely so many muscular contractions.

One pathetic incident showing this foolish faithfulness is that of a Boston mother (she might have been somewhere else, but I chanced to see her in Boston), out walking with her small child whom she was leading by the hand. The mother said, "Take a deep breath, Mary; it is good for you." Such an endeavor to make the simple physiological process a consciously attained thing is harmful, it is out of joint. If Mary had had a sand-pile, or a dog, to play with, she would have taken a good many deep breaths without thinking of it, and she would have been much better off. And we are like Mary. To find and create community bonds that will take us out-of-doors each day—that is what we need. To make exercise an incident and not an end, in order that it may really help us—this is the second step which must be taken in bridging the gap between knowledge and desire.

What are some of the social exercises? Walking, golfing, canoeing, climbing, dancing—I regard the modern movement which is bringing folk-dancing into the schools as of the utmost significance. It is enjoyable—the boys and girls love it. It is something the love of which goes through life. I saw in Providence a short time ago a class of men who had been meeting twice a week to dance by themselves for several years. Their average age was over sixty; and they used such dances as the Highland Fling. This folk-dancing is wholesome exercise—but primarily it is wholesome socially—it fits modern conditions.

What is the relation between exercise and rest? Work is that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at which we must continue, whether interesting or not, whether we are tired or not. It used to be thought that the prime requisite of rest was the use of faculties other than those involved in the labor of the day. But there is such a thing as fatigue which goes deeper than daily work. We can work so hard as to become exhausted—too exhausted for any kind of work. Perhaps this is *will* fatigue. It is coming to be regarded as fundamentally true that rest from such fatigue demands continuity; that, for example, four periods of fifteen minutes each of rest is not the equivalent of one hour's rest; that a man who goes on a vacation and takes half an hour of his business work every day, is doing the same thing as the man who had a horse with a sore back. He kept the saddle on only a few minutes each day, but the sore did not have a chance to heal. Rest periods must be sufficiently consecutive to overcome consecutive fatigue.

New York is already taking this general need of the community for socializing rest and exercise into view. The new Commissioner of Parks in New York, Charles B. Stover, is opening up facilities for two or three times as many people in the parks and playgrounds as were ever before provided. The Citizen's Recreation Committee of that city has published a pamphlet which tells of the recreation facilities provided by the city of New York. It is astonishing, the facilities for camping out, for boating, for excursions, for games, for the general use not only of the parks, but also of the golf-links and tennis-courts. All sorts of things are furnished by the city as such. If one of the chief perils of our times is the peril of opportunity, it is equally true that there has never been presented to us before anything like the facilities for interesting open-air activities as are now available. For example, it is possible to start from almost any point in New York, in half an hour be on your boat on the Hudson River, and in another hour to be on the wild Palisades cooking supper with driftwood—and all with comparatively little expense. Hundreds do it, and our facilities for such outdoor recreation have hardly begun to be used as yet. This open-air custom is fast becoming common.

The supreme battle of life, it seems to me, comes for most of us between thirty-five and forty-five. The momentum of early youth is gone by that time. The physical capital of youth with which most of us started has largely been expended. Most of our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ideals have been seriously altered by experience. We see things in a different light from what we imagined they were as children. The brilliant color of fancy has faded. At this time it is not counsel that is needed—it is some definite thing to turn to, some definite course to take hold of, which we can carry through until poise is re-established; some concrete course of action to which we can hold, blindly if necessary, till the new and larger relation to life and work and society has been established; something that will make for sanity and wholesomeness. It is a kind of intellectual climacteric that is found in men as well as in women. Women, after their younger children have become six or seven years old—women who have devoted themselves to their families intensely—come up to that time and find necessary some readjustment. Then is the time to make for themselves a new relation to the community, or to degenerate. The fundamental thing to do at this time is to keep the whole body keenly alive. Thus the fundamental thing to be sought is sanity, which rests upon a basis of good digestion, good sleep, and a skin that is wholesomely alive and responsive to cold and heat. Now is the time to go out-of-doors and feel the instinctive response to the simple and elemental things of life. The person who goes out-of-doors and feels a blast of cold air on the face, and does not enjoy it, is not on the high level, but on the downward road. The person who still sees that the grass is green and the sky blue, who has simple, definite response of enjoyment to the natural elements, is sane in the sense that I am using the word. This enjoyment of the broader element in exercise is the common test by which we can know ourselves during the time when the youthful ideals are going, and before the larger ideals are established.

These larger ideals involve a new definition of life for ourselves. What is life for? The object of life is to increase life—to live vitally. No other thing is adequate. Any loss of perspective that puts the earning of money, the securing of professional reputation, and that sort of thing, first, which does not give to sleep its place, which does not give to out-of-doors its place, is a distortion, and cannot result in the biggest things nor the best work in life.

It is only lack of perspective that permits us to see our work so close that it seems more important to us than life. Life itself is the true object—full, free and social life—and we need to stand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

back from our work and get this true perspective. Some Sunday or some week, when you are free from work, ask yourself what is worth while, and then readjust things. Assign to drudgery its place—if it absorbs all the effort, it makes drudgery of life itself. Assign rest and outdoors to their places; assign to your friends their time; and then live the balanced life. In no other way can we permanently accomplish this but by the establishment of community customs.

We have done away with the contagion of talk about ill health. It remains for us to socialize our recreations, to learn to play in groups. Carry on wholesome social exercise—functions out-of-doors—week-end parties—camping trips—boating—folk-dancing—all that is at the foundation of everything which is sane and simple and worth while. This is the answer to the question—the solution of the problem of bridging the gap between knowing how to be healthy and sane, and being healthy and sane. This is the *vita nuova,* to be reached by socializing out-of-door rest and recreation.

LUTHER HALSEY GULICK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPLY TO ARCHBISHOP IRELAND'S STRICTURES UPON THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM BURT, D.D., LL.D., BISHOP OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, RESIDENT IN EUROPE.

LAST February, on the occasion of Mr. Fairbanks's visit to Rome, Archbishop Ireland made, through the press, a most violent attack on the work of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Italy, and more especially on that in the city of Rome. He was supported by his colleagues and dependents from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and soon all the forces of Romanism in Europe and America were bombarding us from every side.

The Archbishop said: "American Methodists in Rome are active and pernicious proselyters. I was in Rome last winter, and I made a very particular study of the Methodist propaganda. The means employed are by no means honorable." "The books circulated and displayed in their bookstores are slanders."

Later, in April, on the occasion of Mr. Roosevelt's visit to Rome, the attack was renewed, and Archbishop Ireland added that "the Methodist propaganda was vile and calumnious in its assaults upon Catholic faith and dishonest in its methods to win proselytes." "I have received from Rome," he says, "most reliable data that more than justify any statement I have heretofore made, or may at any other time be prepared to make, with regard to this Methodist propaganda."

In view of all that had been published, the Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on May 9th, issued a brief statement in which they denied the accusations, challenged proof and reaffirmed their confidence in the work and workers in Italy.

In reply to this, Archbishop Ireland contributes a long article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for July, in which, with a great show of documentary evidence, he pretends to confirm his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outrageous assertions and statements by a method strangely lacking in candor.

We freely concede that, having received his cue, the Archbishop made skilful play to do his part effectively. It was a difficult task to apply esoteric rules of judgment before a world jury, particularly when he was set to convict a reputable ecclesiastical body of offences of which his own client had long been notoriously guilty.

Thus doubly handicapped, the Archbishop might be excused for making a brave show of confidence in his cause for tactical purposes, and even for resorting to cumulative emphasis where equity failed him; but there can be no warrant for so garbling or perverting the written words of the Bishops as to make them mean more or less than they meant in their proper relation. The Archbishop must have known that not one in a thousand of his readers would have at hand the words of the Methodist Bishops. Their statement of the authorized methods of their Church in all Catholic countries was brief and very temperate. It was quite within the compass and dignity of his undertaking to quote it entire; moreover, it was indispensable to an honest presentation of the status of the question in issue at that juncture. The Vatican had arraigned the methods of the Methodist Church in Italy. The Bishops clearly stated those methods, the methods endorsed by them and sanctioned by the Church, viz.: "*The preaching of the Gospel in its simplicity, and conducting schools where they are needed, schools which recognize the plain teachings of the New Testament as of supreme authority in religion and ethics.*" But in his first article, taking the responsibility for giving what he calls "the pertinent points of the Bishops' statements," the Archbishop omits this entire section, which contains the essence of the Bishops' utterance! Omits it while *appearing* to be quoting continuously; omits it without any mark, remark or printer's sign showing any omission at that point, though he does indicate other omissions! We do not like to believe it, but from what later appears in his article (page 29) it would seem that he omitted this official statement of authorized Methodist methods in order, at a convenient point in his discussion, to blanket in, as if under the Bishops' endorsement as a part of Methodist methods, certain alleged practices which he well knows would be condemned by every Bishop and by every leading Methodist in the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again and again he dexterously quotes the Bishops' words that "our methods are the same that they have been for forty years," in such forced connection as utterly to falsify their plain meaning. No exigency of debate can cover this offence against candor and simple honesty. When an advocate virtually asks his jury to trust him to give the "pertinent points" of his opponent's brief and omits to quote the *most* pertinent he has done a wrong, which, being discovered, must cost him the confidence of his jury and the loss of his case. He has obscured the truth in order to perpetrate an injustice, and this under the guise of telling the truth and serving justice.

Observe: What the Methodist Bishops did declare and endorse as to methods the Archbishop carefully leaves out, and by the ruse of a cunningly laid train of intimations and inferences running through several pages he manages to substitute the alleged tricks of a lot of conscienceless ex-priests and other hirelings—as he paints them—as "methods" having the endorsement of all the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in their bald lying! By such subtlety the Bishops are made to slander themselves and their Church. Then the complacent prosecutor himself starts the applause in anticipation of a verdict won! To quote his own words far more fittingly than where he used them, this is "moral integrity with a vengeance."

The Archbishop will pardon us if we now call into question the truthfulness of some of the statements made and the reliability of some of the documents produced.

He first asserted that he had been to Rome and had studied the Methodist propaganda for himself. Yes, we know that Archbishop Ireland has often been to Rome. Once we remember he came to defend Americanism, but surrendered to autocracy, and as penance for his daring liberalism wrote an article on the necessity of the temporal power of the Papacy. Later he came to deliver an address on Abraham Lincoln, but refused to do so when he learned that the King of Italy was to be toasted at the same banquet.

In these frequent visits to Rome the Archbishop might have studied our work for himself, since we have always kept open house and have done nothing that we were ashamed of or afraid to have him see. We cannot possibly understand his utterances —many of them mere inventions—except on the ground that per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonally he was ignorant of the facts, and that as a faithful servant of the hierarchy he simply signed his name to that which he was told to say by his master at the Vatican. This seems the more evident from the fact that nearly all the material in the article appeared simultaneously in the Roman Catholic papers throughout the United States in April, having been forwarded from Rome.

The Archbishop pretends to derive the evidence in support of his allegations from four principal sources: "Four and One-half Years in the Italy Mission—A Criticism of Missionary Methods," by Dr. E. S. Stackpole; "Europe and Methodism," by the writer; "*Cenni Storici della Chiesa Methodista Episcopale*"; and "*L'Evangelista.*" Under this cover, however, he brings in his "*most reliable data.*" Later we shall see how very reliable it is.

If the Archbishop had personally studied the situation he would not have been compelled to go back and dig up an old book which is out of print, written sixteen years ago, and which at the time of its publication was ably answered by Dr. J. M. Buckley and others who were perfectly familiar with the situation. The same book was answered again recently in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW by Dr. S. M. Vernon. We did not imagine that the Archbishop was so hard pushed for material that he would reprint those old statements and figures without verifying them or that he would dress them up as recent facts. The book was printed in 1894. Many of its statements refer to incidents and gossip that took place twenty or thirty years prior to that time and had no reference whatever to facts existing then or now. No unbiased mind reading the book can fail to be impressed with two facts—that it was written by a disappointed man and that the difficulties of our mission work in Italy were tremendous because of the centuries of Papal dominion. If space would permit we would turn that whole book back on Archbishop Ireland and make him and his Church directly responsible for all the unworthy characters therein described. Can any one imagine for a moment that Archbishop Ireland is really distressed because "the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, whom he personally knows and esteems," are being deceived and hoodwinked by those who represent them in Europe? Thank God, we do not have to go to him or to the Vatican for a certificate of character. Our people know us and have con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fidence in us. The King of Italy, his Government and the Italian people, among them many liberal priests, know us, and we have in our possession precious tokens of their esteem and confidence.

The difficulty is that American Methodists and American Protestants generally do not know what Roman Catholicism is at its chief centre; nor do they understand its attitude toward other religious faiths. Archbishop Ireland says that the attitude of the Vatican toward the Methodists is that "*of absolute aloofness.*" What audacious courage he must have to make use in public print of such an expression! How inconsistent, for in another place he says that this Methodist propaganda has gone so far that the Vatican was obliged to organize a special "Society for the Preservation of the Faith" to counteract the influence of the Methodists. We have known this for years and we have in our possession the Pope's letter authorizing its organization. But the business of this society was not to stand "aloof," but (here we borrow the language of the Archbishop) "*by vile epithets, most shameless calumnies, insults most outrageous, dishonorable methods, and the co-operation of the lowest and most disreputable allies,*" to thwart our purpose at every step. More than once we have felt the sting of its whip and have seen others suffer under its relentless persecution. As far as the law will permit, it operates according to the old methods of the Inquisition. The people who attend our meetings and the children who frequent our schools are all known to this society, and every imaginable influence is brought to bear on them in order to get them away from us. The boycott, ostracism and scorn are the common weapons of the confessional. "Cajoled" by the priests, the wife torments her husband, the young woman threatens not to marry the young man to whom she is engaged, and people snub their friends simply because they associate with these nefarious Methodists. People may drink, swear, lie, steal and live as debauchers and this "Society for the Preservation of the Faith" will not trouble itself; but one thing they must not do—they must not enter an evangelical church, because there they will lose "the faith of their fathers." We have seen children cry bitterly because they were taken from our schools; and our converts, many of whom before they came to us had not been inside of a Papal church for years, have suffered ostracism and hunger rather than yield to the cruel pressure from these zealous servants

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Papacy. They would use the thumbscrews, the dungeon, the rack and the stake if they could. Thank God, that day is forever past!

While we were erecting our great building on Via Venti Settembre we had five lawsuits on hand at one time, all of them provoked and sustained against us by emissaries of the Vatican. We won out, however, in every instance. For ten years we fought through all the courts, from the lowest to the highest, for our right to be in Italy at all. The clericals said that we had no legal standing in the country and hence could not hold property nor receive legacies. In the lower courts, where Papal agencies could influence the judges, we lost every time; but in the higher courts we found justice, all previous decisions were reversed, and our legal position and rights fully and definitely established. We have won our present freedom inch by inch and have come up through much tribulation.

Recently our Baptist friends and members of the Salvation Army have also been having troublesome times in Italy. There have been persecutions at Floridia, Noto and Bisaccia. In September, 1909, Rev. Mr. Fasulo, a Baptist minister, wrote a pamphlet criticising some of the foolish priestly inventions about St. Corrado, a patron saint. The clericals became furious and cried that such a heretic should not be tolerated in that place. The priests spoke against him from the pulpit. A procession was formed and a pretended urn of the saint was carried through the streets. When the wrath of the fanatical mob was at white-heat the poor deluded people were incited to set fire to the Baptist church, and the pastor with his daughter had to flee for their lives.

At Floridia the priests asserted that Protestant preachers were advocates of a new religion and that they worshipped the devil. For a long time there had been no rain, and the priests informed the people from the pulpit that the cause of the drought was the presence in their midst of these Protestants. Little slips of paper were distributed exhorting the people to drive out the heretics. Then a priest passing before the Protestant church, carrying the host, halted and gave the sign for the ignorant women to batter the door with stones. On October 17th, 1909, while the worshippers were assembled at eleven o'clock in the morning and the young pastor was preaching on the Beatitudes, the place was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violently assaulted by a mad crowd led on by the priests. Much damage was done and several persons wounded.

These are only some of the episodes in our endeavors to teach the people lessons in the liberty of the Gospel of Christ. We could fill volumes with such incidents, all certified to by public documents and the testimony of persons now living. This is not ancient history, but modern, and represents the spirit and attitude of Romanism toward all Protestant denominations to-day.

Talk about "bribing" and "cajoling." They are the ones who are in that business. We have had no money to give away, and to take care of the poor people whom Romanism has impoverished would be an impossible task. The Papacy absorbs all the money, lands, industries and energies of a people and, having reduced them to ignorance, beggary and rags, leaves them to suffer. For proof of this we have only to look, not at the history of Italy alone, but at that of all the so-called Roman Catholic countries of the world.

These defamers of the Methodists in Rome have much to say about the enormous sums of money they assert we spend in Italy. Some of them, like Archbishop Ireland, say "twelve millions," others "fourteen millions" and others over "twenty millions," while the fact is, as shown by Bishop Cranston, only $1,635,848 has been spent in all these thirty-eight years, and a large part of that sum is still available in valuable properties. But in the use of figures, as in the use of adjectives and epithets, they seem to have no regard for truth, so long as they can make the desired impression.

Does not Archbishop Ireland know that we are obliged to keep strict accounts of all money received and expended, and that the Methodists in America know, and he also may know, where and how every dollar has been spent? Do the people of the Roman Catholic Church in America know how the millions that flow into the Vatican treasury are spent? Try, if you can, to get a look into their accounts. "Italy," says the Archbishop, "is the Catholic of Catholic lands." "Rome is the Pope's exclusive parish." The following lines taken from the Vatican paper "*Rome*," February 26th, 1910, would seem to indicate that not all in the city of Rome are the devoted followers of the Pope. Speaking of the recent commemoration of the martyrdom of Giordano Bruno, it says:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Every year the annual demonstration has grown in size and menace. This year it has not been confined to Rome, but has been duplicated in Florence, Naples, Bari and elsewhere. It is estimated that over twenty thousand persons [50,000 nearer the truth] took part in the procession here. It was composed of the usual elements, freemasons, socialists, anarchists, university students and various labor organizations. The municipality of Rome was represented by a majority of its members. The cortege was headed by an immense inscription: 'The Roman Democracy for Giordano Bruno. Against the religious congregations. For the School. For the Family.' Whenever this demonstration passed a Catholic church on the line of march it dipped its banners in sign of protest. The orators of the occasion were the Deputies who represented in Italian Parliament the centre of the Catholic world. All denounced the aggressions of the clericals and clamored for the suppression of the religious congregations [meaning, of course, monks and nuns], for the enactment of new laws against the Church, and above all for the abolition of all religious instruction in the schools."

The same paper continues:

"This may well serve to call attention to the present situation in the Eternal City. Of its five Deputies four are violent anti-clericals, and the fifth can be anti-clerical on occasion; its mayor is bitterly anti-clerical and is one of the chief personages of Italian freemasonry. The last shred of religious teaching has been abolished in the public schools; the organizations of the working classes are dominated by the anti-clerical spirit; three-fourths of the newspapers are anti-clerical."

This is not our representation of conditions in Rome, but what a Vatican paper acknowledges. We must remember, too, that these Deputies in Parliament and representatives in the municipal government are elected to their responsible positions by the votes of the people who are determined to free themselves from Papal and priestly rule. It would seem from all this that the Pope had lost his influence even in his own parish, and that at present a large majority of the population of Rome is anti-clerical. We Methodists in Italy are not proselyting, but by the help of God we are seeking to lead the people back to a simple faith in Jesus, the Son of God and the Saviour of the world.

We make no apology for that which the Archbishop quotes from "Methodism and Europe" and "*Cenni Storici.*" We are sorry that he did not quote more, because these passages express in the mildest possible form what Roman Catholicism is in Italy and the need of our mission there. After fourteen years of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

residence in Rome, there is no need of a "penny child's Catechism" in order that we may learn what Romanism is. We are not talking about ancient theories or printed doctrines, but about what we know the institution stands for at its chief centre. If, however, the Archbishop would like to have us discuss the Catechism, we could do it, as we have copies on hand in both English and Italian. We have often wondered at some of the things omitted from this Catechism; as well as at some of the instructions given in it and claims made by it. For example, in the Italian edition, the second Commandment is left out and the tenth divided into two so as to complete the number. The Rev. William Burgess, of Rome, writes that a Catholic Catechism recently sanctioned by Pope Pius X contains the following question and answer: *Q.* "If a Christian should be offered a Bible by a Protestant, what should he do?" *A.* "He should reject it with horror; and if he may have received it inadvertently, he should immediately throw it into the fire or give it to the parish priest."

Now, let us look at some of "the most reliable data." On page 17 of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for July Archbishop Ireland says: "That the purpose of Methodism is understood by the Roman population, Catholic and non-Catholic, is made clear by '*Il Giornale d'Italia*' (April 5th, 1910), a newspaper quite sufficiently tinged with modernism and anti-clericalism to absolve it from any spirit of subserviency to the Vatican." Then follows a quotation from "*Il Giornale d'Italia*" which is certainly not very complimentary to the Methodists. We were amazed when we read it in the Archbishop's article, for this paper, one of the most respectable in Rome, had always spoken well of our institutions and work. We immediately procured a copy of "*Il Giornale d'Italia*" and also of "*La Tribuna,*" for April 5th. The two papers are now before us, and the paragraph quoted by Archbishop Ireland is precisely the same in both, but both papers declare that it is a communication from the Vatican. "*Il Giornale d'Italia*" has for head-line: "That which they say in the Vatican." "*La Tribuna*" has for head-line: "The thought of the Santa Sede" (Holy See). "*Il Giornale d'Italia*" says that the declaration was furnished by the Vatican and simply reported by them. "*La Tribuna*" says that the information was furnished by an eminent person and agrees perfectly with what the Santa Sede would express in an official note concerning the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fairbanks-Roosevelt incidents. When a few days ago we related these facts to an eminent citizen he replied: "Some people say that the Bible declares that '*there is no God,*' but it is well to look into the Bible and see for yourself who made the declaration." Did Archbishop Ireland knowingly and deliberately attempt to deceive the American public in this matter, or did he simply quote the paragraph that was furnished him from Rome and blindly sign his name to it?

The cartoon in "*L'Evangelista,*" entitled "My kingdom is not of this world," which the Archbishop criticises, was a photograph of a model made by an eminent artist in competition for prizes that had been offered for the best representation of "The fall of the temporal power of the Papacy." This model won one of the prizes, and the photograph was furnished to our editor by the artist himself. Nothing could have been more appropriate for the celebration of the 20th of September.

On page 18 the Archbishop says: "'*La Nazione*' of Florence, a quite un-Catholic journal, publishes, April 13th, 1910, on the occasion of the visit of Mr. Roosevelt to Rome, a letter of its Roman correspondent. Among other things he says: 'Some days ago, passing through Via Venti Settembre, I stopped to glance at the titles of books exhibited in the windows of their [Methodist] publishing-house. Here are samples: '*Le Infamie dei Papi*' ('Infamies of Popes'), '*Le Lordure dei Pontifici*' ('Pontifical Filthiness'), '*Il Papa va Scacciato*' ('The Pope Driven Away'), and so on, in the list before my eyes."

Here also we must make a few corrections in the Archbishop's "most reliable data." Everybody in Italy knows that "*La Nazione*" of Florence is an ultra-conservative paper in strict alliance with the clerical party. No windows of our publishing-house front on Via Venti Settembre, and only one small window where books and papers are exhibited on Via Firenze. The fact, however, is that the books mentioned were never published, owned or sold by us. No one ever saw them in our window at any time, for we have never had them. Hence the statement of the correspondent is absolutely false, simply invented for the occasion. If the Archbishop had only reported what he saw, since he says he was there and investigated for himself, he would not have fallen a victim to such unreliable data of others. No doubt such books can be procured in Rome, though we have never seen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them; but the titles given indicate what the Italian people are constantly thinking and talking about.

We are called to account because we do not always speak of the Roman Catholic Church in "*L'Evangelista*" as the *Catholic Church*. Is the Church of Rome to-day *Catholic?* In no sense does it have any moral right to appropriate to itself that designation. We can hardly any longer say "Roman" because a majority of the people of Rome have repudiated it. Its proper title is the "*Papal Church.*" This justly indicates its character. Certainly we are not insulting any one when we say *Papal Church,* since every loyal Roman Catholic must reverence and obey the Pope.

In referring to the celebration in Rome of the Giordano Bruno anniversary, February 17th, 1910, the Archbishop says that the event "was seized upon by socialists and anarchists as a propitious occasion to vent forth insults against *civic law and order,* no less than against the Catholic Church, against religion of any kind or form." The London "Saturday Review" describes the Bruno demonstration as disgraceful to common civilization. But the demonstration was anti-Papal; it obtained applause from "*L'Evangelista.*"

We have seen that the Mayor of the city with a majority of the municipal council were there, that many of the leading members of Parliament were there, that university students from all over the country were there, the working-men's associations were there—in a word, fifty thousand representatives of the brain and brawn and hope of new free Italy were there to commemorate the martyrdom of a hero of liberty. Of course the demonstration was anti-Papal, because it was the Pope who burned Bruno. Of course it was anti-Papal, because to the Italians the Pope is the personification of autocracy and tyranny. It is absolutely false, however, to say that the demonstration was "disgraceful to common civilization" and "against civic law and order." It was an orderly, dignified, enthusiastic demonstration of an intelligent, determined people such as would have reflected honor on any land. The trouble was that the Archbishop's data instead of being "most reliable" was from a clerical correspondent to the London "Saturday Review." If the Archbishop had been there he could not have failed *as an American* to have been touched with the enthusiasm of the people. The music and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marching would have reminded him of his own free land. Of course many of those in line belonged to the extreme parties. Are they not where they are to-day because of the tyranny of the Popes? The pendulum is swinging back to its proper place and we Methodists are helping to bring it there. "*L'Evangelista,*" one of the ablest papers printed in the Italian language, unhesitatingly applauds all such demonstrations on the part of a redeemed and free people.

Here says the Archbishop: "The climax is reached in the hearty endorsement given to the '*Asino.*'" "I quote," he says, "from the Roman journal, '*Il Bastone,*' February 11th, 1910." We must here inform the public of an important fact which the Archbishop has failed to mention, namely, that "*Il Bastone*" is a paper wholly at the service of the priests. It is entirely clerical and hence "*most reliable*" for the Vatican.

If Archbishop Ireland, instead of giving to the press that which had been sent to him from Rome, had simply taken the trouble to read the "*L'Evangelista*" for himself, he would not have dared to misrepresent us and deceive the public as he has done by quoting only a part, leaving out that which gave the meaning to the whole. The copy of "*L'Evangelista*" referred to is before us. It says:

"We applaud the purpose of the '*Asino*' to support the minority of believers who are being crushed by the Church of the state. It would seem that this fighting organ of Sig. Podrecca is coming toward the right way. There are other problems loftier and more complex than simple anti-religious positivism.—There are fields of common activity upon which we may give a fraternal hand in the sacred war against the heresies and the obscurantism of Romanism. When '*L'Asino*' shall have taken a decided position toward these questions, vastly more important and more practical, its combative force will be multiplied a hundredfold and no magistrate will then be disposed to prosecute it because of its criticisms of the *sacrificial eucharist.*—This new direction of '*L'Asino*' is indicative and will excite serious preoccupations in Vatican circles."

A later number of "*L'Evangelista*" said:

"It will be useless for us to affirm for the hundredth time that our support of '*L'Asino*' is based simply on our recognition of the right of propaganda and criticism and not on the fact that we agree with all of its ideas. We jealously reserve our right to disapprove the rational-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istic and anti-religious campaign of '*L'Asino*,' believing it to be damaging to the cause of anti-clericalism and foreign to the propaganda of socialism."

There is no equivocation or compromise in the position of "*L'Evangelista.*" It stands every time for pure religion that manifests itself in truth and righteousness.

After the Archbishop has forcibly allied "*L'Evangelista*" to "*L'Asino,*" he asks: "What is '*L'Asino*'? It is the filthiest of filthy publications. Its articles reek with obscenity. Self-respecting people quickly turn away when at the street-corner kiosks their eyes light upon its lurid illustrations. In November, 1908, the United States postal authorities forbade its entrance into America."

Rather an unholy alliance for a Methodist paper! But let us look at the "facts," for perhaps here again the Archbishop may have been misinformed by those who were "aloof" from the truth. We admit that "*L'Asino*" is terrific in its war on the Papacy, and even Archbishop Ireland must admit that it is very able and most effective. In saying, however, that "self-respecting people quickly turn away when their eyes light upon its lurid illustrations" he condemns at one stroke tens of thousands of the best and most intelligent people in Italy who do not turn away from it, but buy it and read it. Will the Archbishop tell us which is the worst, "*Il Mulo*" ("The Mule") or "*L'Asino*" ("The Donkey")? "*Il Mulo*" was produced and is maintained for the express purpose of kicking "*L'Asino.*" "*Il Mulo*" is edited by a priest and deals in indecent jokes which are used to discredit and place in ridicule everything that has to do with liberalism. "*L'Asino*" prints the photographs of lovers of Pius IX, the cuts of the indecent figures on the bronze doors of St. Peter's, and of pictures in the *loggia* of the Vatican and holds up to public contempt the shameful moral teachings of "*St. Alfonso dei Liguori.*" In its "*pozzo nero*" it gives the more recent disgraceful doings of Romish priests.

That the things reported have been true is demonstrated by the fact that, though the laws in Italy against defamation are very stringent, and that though during seventeen years "*L'Asino*" has been prosecuted forty-three times, it has never been condemned by the courts.

Americans, of course, will be impressed by the fact that "in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

November, 1908, the United States postal authorities forbade its entrance into America," as Archbishop Ireland informs us. What, however, are the facts? The Vatican, becoming alarmed at the damage being done to its cause by "*L'Asino*" among the Italians in America, sent Monsignor Falconio to America with the definite mission of influencing the Government to exclude "*L'Asino*" from the United States. This Monsignor soon put in motion all the powerful machinery of the Romish Church in America for the accomplishment of his purpose. He first directed his efforts toward the White House, but finding that this would not be the surest way to success, he then brought all his influence to bear upon the postal authorities and succeeded in his purpose. He was congratulated and rewarded by the Vatican. When one, then high in authority, was recently asked how this happened, he simply expressed his surprise and said that this was the first time he had known anything about it. Archbishop Ireland and his colleagues did it and then said that "the United States postal authorities forbade its entrance into America." The Archbishop, however, must know that "*L'Asino*" is still alive and has become an American citizen. More than ten thousand copies of the American edition, which corresponds to the Italian, are sold every week. The priests, of course, are furious. Several times they have sequestered copies in local post-offices, but on learning the facts the postmaster has been obliged to let them pass. Perhaps they will soon bring "*Il Mulo*" across the water and set it to kicking "*L'Asino*" in America as it is doing in Italy, though we are of the opinion that the free air of America might not be good for "*Il Mulo.*"

Perhaps the American public have not been informed of a recent case before the Supreme Court of Leipzig. Some time ago an editor of that city published a tract by a Mr. Ferk, which was nothing else than a series of extracts from the moral theology of Alfonso dei Liguori translated into German, with a preface which called attention to the immorality of such theological precepts. The State attorney initiated proceedings against the author and publisher of the tract, on the ground that it was an outrage against public morals and decency and a defamation against the Catholic Church. The court, however, acquitted the accused, because, while the publication of the tract was an offence against decency, it could not be regarded as immoral, since the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tract was published with the sole purpose of proving the immorality of the teachings of Alfonso dei Liguori. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, which has confirmed *in toto* the sentence of the lower court, which pronounces as immoral the moral teachings of the Romish Church.

On page 22 the Archbishop informs the public that "the Catholic Church is severe in its *sacerdotal exigencies:* the *unworthy priest* is quickly forced from the ranks." All depends, of course, on what he means by "*sacerdotal exigencies*" and "*unworthy priest.*" Every one knows that the Papal Church requires every bishop to obey the Pope and every priest to obey the bishop. If, therefore, the Archbishop means by "*sacerdotal exigencies*" absolute obedience to the Curia, we agree with him that the Romish Church is severe, even very severe. But if he means by "sacerdotal exigencies," purity of character and a strict moral life, we must confess that in Italy it is one of the loosest institutions in this respect we have ever intimately known. The Archbishop is right when he says that "so long as human nature remains some such [unworthy ones] there will be." That is so and they will be in every Church. But the virtue of the Church is in discovering such and turning them out of the sacred office of ministers of the blessed Christ. All over Italy, however, the immorality of the priests is proverbial. We do not mean by this that every priest is immoral; no, there are some noble exceptions, but many of them are shamefully so. If we should publish what we personally know on this matter, we fear that the district attorney would be after us for offending public decency.

In Italy priests are not often tried or expelled from the Church for drunkenness, lying, dishonesty or immorality, but the moment that one dares to pray for the King or Parliament, the moment he is known to venture inside an evangelical church, except as a spy, or speaks well of evangelical Christians, or tolerates among his people the free circulation of the Bible, that very moment he is called to account.

Some of the poor fellows have been so nurtured on Jesuitical casuistry that they do not know the meaning of truth or honesty. The end justifies the means. One day we received a most pitiful letter, well written, from a monastery. It was from a young man to whom some light had come and who wanted to get out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from that prison life. He said: "Please send a telegram stating that my father is dangerously ill and needs me immediately." We replied that we did not lie, even to get a man out of prison. He wrote then a long letter in which he tried to prove that in doing as he had proposed we would not be telling a lie because of the end to be accomplished. We have kept the letter because at that time it was for us a revelation. The Methodists have never sought cast-off priests. Those who have come to us have presented clean papers from the Papal Church, otherwise we would never have looked at them. After a few weeks or months, we have discovered that some of them were unworthy men and of no moral worth whatever.

On page 27 of the Archbishop's article we come to what he says he knows personally. "Of Methodist schools and refugees in Rome during recent years I speak from personal observation and inquiry." It was well that he added "and inquiry," for to my knowledge the Archbishop has never deigned personally to visit any of our schools, hence we look in vain for any information from personal knowledge, and what he has acquired through inquiry is not true.

What are the facts? Soon after we arrived in Rome, in 1890, under the auspices of our Epworth League, we instituted during the winter season classes for the study of English, French and German. The class in English was especially well attended. The lessons, however, were not gratuitous, as the Archbishop asserts, because we wanted only those who really desired to study and were willing to pay for it. As soon as our pupils were able to read English we provided them each with a copy of the New Testament, which they read, committing some passages to memory. Did we do harm in teaching these young people English and in storing their minds with some passages from God's word? When the priests saw the success of our enterprise, Irish monks were brought upon the scene, and they opened classes in English on the same street with us and gave lessons gratuitously. We had other work to do and often had to be away from Rome, and when away there was no one else at that time to take our place. The trouble has been all the time that we have had to do our work amid bitter opposition and cruel persecution, but with absolutely inadequate means, while the Vatican has had its untold millions with which to pay its agents. While, however, these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evening classes for languages did not continue many years, they passed into the more permanent educational equipment of our schools and institutions which exist to-day, and which were never more prosperous and efficient than now, as hundreds of our friends from America personally know because *they* have seen for themselves.

In none of our schools is the instruction gratuitous. In all of them there are a few scholarships, as there are in schools in America, for the benefit of some poor but worthy boys and girls. What we lack all the time is adequate equipment. We need larger places in which to receive the many who wish to come to us and scholarships to help those who will do their very utmost to help themselves. If we could have one-fourth of the money the Archbishop says we have had, we could help to make Rome once more a Christian city. What our schools are and what we do and what we require are all clearly printed in our prospectus, which the parents or guardians of all children who come to us readily subscribe to. We have pupils from homes of many creeds and of no creed at all. We have faithfully kept our promises to the public "respecting the religious convictions of all," even though we have had a simple Christian service in the schools on Sunday and family devotions every day. No one but the Romish Hierarchy has ever accused us of bad faith. We have ever sought to teach by precept and example what it means to be a loyal disciple of the blessed Christ, and if any of our pupils have become Methodists, as some of them have, it has been wholly of their own free will. Among the most precious treasures we have are letters from those who have been in our schools and are now out in the world meeting the problems of life with the knowledge, faith and love they there acquired. Here before us is a letter, just received, written by a well-educated man and it is only one of hundreds:

"ROME, *August 6th, 1910.*

"I have received the programme requested and I thank you. Desiring to give my two daughters a complete education, and desiring also that they may grow up in the evangelical faith, I would be so happy if I could place them in your magnificent and modern school, but unfortunately my financial conditions will not permit me, and I must be resigned against my will to accept the offer of a relative of ours who is a nun in the College of ——, where my children would be received and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cared for at the expense of our relative, who, knowing well my anti-clerical opinions, would readily make this sacrifice to save my children, as she says, from perdition. It is painfully sad that in Italy, and especially here in Rome, we cannot get away from the influence of the despised priest. The trouble is that we have no adequate institutions."

On page 29 the Archbishop becomes "hilarious" over the fraudulent exaggerations of the statistics reported. Had he forgotten what he wrote on page 22 in regard to the severe sifting process? We leave it to him to harmonize the two statements. In Italy we have never been over-anxious about statistics of membership. We have been content to sow seeds of truth, build institutions and schools, print books and papers, and extend our spiritual and spiritualizing influence to the moral, social and civic life of the nation; and to-day we have abundant reason to bless God for the marvellous changes for the better that have taken place in this Kingdom under our very eyes during the past twenty years. Galileo is right, "The world does move," and that part of it which we call Italy is moving rapidly away from the Papacy, but onward and upward toward God.

"Against the reports of Bishop Burt I set the statements," says Archbishop Ireland, "recently forwarded to me by a well-known Roman priest actively engaged in counteracting the Methodist propaganda, Rev. P. Mandato, S. J." This is some more of the Archbishop's "most reliable data." Who is the one who furnished these data? *A Jesuit.* He is one of those who have been so trained in Jesuitical casuistry that they do not know what truth means. We have here on our desk a book published by the Rev. P. De Mandato in 1904, a pretentious volume of 380 pages. It gathers up in one his several polemical tracts against Protestants in general and the Methodist Episcopal Church in Rome in particular. He seems to have been stirred up especially against the Methodists because he found them distributing on the streets of Rome cards of invitation to their meetings. On the back of the cards was a list of the dogmas and practices that had been introduced into the Papal Church since the time of the Apostles, with the date when each one was accepted. Instead of replying to these historical facts, he makes a tirade against Protestants and their work. If his book could be translated faithfully into English and circulated among Americans, it would be a valuable document for Protestantism, since in it we find all the old pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tensions of the Papacy, in their most stupid arrogance, served up for us in Jesuitical sophisms. Here is what one in Rome says: "The large use which Archbishop Ireland has made of Pio De Mandato is sure proof of the pitiable poverty of his arguments. In Italy an article written by an Archbishop and padded with quotations from the writings of De Mandato would make even the stones laugh. He is, first of all, a Jesuit, member of that order created for the special purpose of combating and destroying the Protestant Reformation. He is the leading spirit in the Society for the Preservation of the Faith, a society formed in Rome by the Jesuits for the express purpose of carrying on war against Protestants, and especially against the Methodists." Of his writings another says: "The critical review of his pretended historical facts only proves his bad faith. The courage acquired in demolishing so many historical truths renders him audacious in lying about facts that occur in the full light of our day." In his appeal to Roman Catholics to avoid Protestants, De Mandato says: "Do not allow yourselves to be seduced by the lies and captious sophisms of those who have miserably abandoned the sheepfold of Christ, but flee from them as you would flee from those infected by a plague."

After producing all these most *unreliable data,* the Archbishop has the courage to conclude that he has proved his case against the declaration of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church and has fufilled his task, which was "to justify the attitude of aloofness adopted by the Vatican toward Methodism," while he has simply proved his own aloofness from the truth.

We, too, would venture to give our explanation of the Fairbanks-Roosevelt incidents. Cardinal Merry Del Val is a Spaniard. One of those who at heart detests Americans for what they did in the late war with Spain. He is now in an eminent position, the practical ruler of the Papal world. This was his first splendid opportunity to satisfy his spirit for revenge, especially with the leader of the "Rough Riders." He must, however, find some reason for his action and here conveniently at hand were the "pernicious" Methodists. Another motive may have been to crack a political whip over the heads of American politicians so as to intimidate all such who might come to Rome in the future. But God, who can make even the wrath of man to praise Him, will overrule these base and unworthy motives and make these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incidents to result in good for the enlightenment of the people on the history and work of the Romish Church.

Centuries have passed since our fathers broke with Rome, and a new generation has arisen that knows little about the Protestant exodus and of the struggles in the wilderness. Some from a cowardly dislike of religious controversy, some from fear of damaging their personal interests or of disturbing their personal peace and comfort, and some from a desire to appear tolerant, liberal and broad-minded in these days prefer to be silent on the Romish question. It seems to be an inconvenient subject for those who have political aspirations, for the lawyer, the doctor, the merchant, because of the tyranny which Rome exercises through her tremendous organization. Hence many public men have deliberately ignored the subject, while some of our Church members regard it as a "bore." The result is, on the part of the people, a lamentable ignorance both of the evils from which the Reformation delivered us and of the blessings which the Reformation brought us.

Whatever we have of religious liberty in the nation, of purity and happiness in the home, and of personal independence of conscience we owe to the Protestant Reformation, to separation from the Roman Catholic Church. All was bought for us at a great price. Archbishop Ireland's article, and especially his closing paragraph, reveals the fact that the spirit of Rome is ever the same. Hence it is evident that there can be no peace with Rome until Rome abjures her errors, renounces her desire for temporal power, changes her character and is at peace with Christ.

WILLIAM BURT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REJOINDER TO ARCHBISHOP IRELAND.

BY REV. S. M. VERNON, D.D.

THE reply which I had the honor of making to Archbishop Ireland, in the August number of this REVIEW, calls forth this, among other things, in His Grace's rejoinder: "Dr. Vernon leaps into the arena a free lance, unsummoned and unauthorized by the Board of Bishops." The facts are, that I waited till the last available moment before acting upon the invitation to reply, and only when assured that no one else had undertaken the task and there were only four days left for writing did I enter the field. It seemed to me proper that I should speak, as my brother, Rev. Leroy M. Vernon, D.D., was the founder and for seventeen years the superintendent of the Italian mission; loyalty to him required, now that he is gone, that I should vindicate the integrity of the work he established. I am glad to say that in the Methodist Church we enjoy a personal freedom of speech that does not require us to be "summoned or authorized" by a bishop before we may express our minds.

His Grace complains, in the September number, that I did not answer the charges he made in his former article. I did make sufficient answer by showing that for various reasons his charges were unworthy of serious consideration. First, by showing that his principal witness, Dr. Stackpole, was a spurious Methodist authority and unworthy of credence. When Dr. Stackpole was ruled out of court all the charges based on his testimony, by inexorable logic, fell with this "house built upon the sand." I was not bound to consider any of the charges in detail that had been swept out of court by wholesale. A second reason was the gossipy and trivial character of the charges. He may not consider it beneath his dignity to make them, but I considered it beneath mine to notice them. For example, he charges certain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Methodist pastors with "padding" their statistics for the purpose of making a good showing of numbers. There is only one way of knowing that to be true: that is to examine the church records in these charges and compare them with the published statistics. This Archbishop Ireland did not do, and he published what he did not and could not know to be true. I omitted to state this before partly because I did not wish to put a venerable prelate of the Church in that awkward position, and partly because I believe that the intelligent readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW would see the gossipy and unreal character of these vague accusations without any remarks about them.

A third reason was that there was such a manifest warping and twisting of facts that it was better to leave them in their own nakedness, as monuments of the folly of their author and as evidence of the great straits to which he was put in making out a case against the Methodists in Italy. As where he charges one Methodist pastor with inviting a neighboring congregation to attend services in his church on the occasion of the visit of the presiding elder. That was a very natural thing to do, very like what occurs in every Christian community. If a distinguished minister is to preach in any particular church, notice of the fact is sent to the neighboring churches and to the public press with an invitation to everybody to attend. Often one church suspends services and goes to visit a neighboring church on a special occasion. It remained for an Archbishop to make the accusation, which he cannot prove, that in the case cited it was done for the purpose of giving the presiding elder a false impression of the strength of the congregation. It would be a very dull presiding elder who would not know that the people and pastor from the neighboring church were not members of that congregation, or who would not appreciate their courtesy in being present on the occasion of his visit.

A fourth reason was that his charges were not in form to admit of disproof, nor were they supported by any evidence requiring it. In all court proceedings, and in logical order, we first have the name of the accused, the words or acts complained of, then the time and place where the offence was committed. His Grace says he read in a Florence newspaper an offensive list of titles of books displayed in the window of the Methodist bookstore in Rome and asks us to accept that as evidence. He says

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Methodists "slander" the Pope, but he names no man who does it, nor the words of slander, nor the time or place. He asks me to disprove a charge of slander before he has named the slander or given any proof that it exists. He charges me with being "funny," and indeed I am in a very funny mood now, and am strongly tempted to give it expression and to call upon the whole civilized world to laugh at this most grotesque spectacle with a reputed thinker and scholar as its chief actor.

A fifth reason was that there is not a single definite, tangible charge made. It is a tirade instead of an indictment, an old woman's angry scolding rather than a clear thinker's comprehensive, accurate statement. He says, among other things, of our consecrated laborers in Italy that they are in "avowed alliance with lawbreakers and anarchists." I challenge the attention of the civilized world to this attitude of the Roman Catholic Church as represented by one of its most honored prelates toward a heroic band of educated, self-denying and liberty-loving Christian workers seeking the moral and spiritual improvement of a people in whom religious faith has been wounded almost to the death by the nameless wrongs of a corrupt, outgrown and oppressive ecclesiasticism. Will I deny the charge? No! I scorn it!

The Archbishop is not quite fair in dealing with my remarks about the Catholic priests in Italy who offered to enter our ministry for the larger compensation in prospect. I did not say, nor did I give him grounds to infer, that I meant priests who had been expelled from or had voluntarily left the Roman Catholic Church. They were priests in good standing, engaged in the regular duties of priests in the Roman Catholic Church, who, when rejected by our superintendent because their motives were transparent, went back to their duties in the priesthood of that Church, its unwilling servants. The low plane of the moral life of the priests in Italy was a fact I alleged justifying our presence there. From Italy that condition extends in a greater or less degree throughout all lands where that Church exists, entailing upon many lands that most demoralizing influence of a corrupt priesthood. I can find you an Archbishop in the southern part of this continent who is president of an international lottery company, the business of which is about as disreputable as anything the gambling world can show. Not long since in the city of Philadelphia a great Roman Catholic Church

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lottery scheme was projected, and an official of the city Government which is not often accused of being over-conscientious, stepped in and stopped the lawbreaking and demoralizing enterprise. It was not a few discharged priests I was speaking of, but a world-wide low moral plane, having its origin and source in Italy. Alas! my brother, in speaking of these things, I am not taking comfort to myself, as you charge, thinking I "have imprinted a few black marks on the face of Catholicism"; somebody else imprinted them there; I have only called attention to them and recommended a thorough washing. God knows, my brother, it would be the joy of my life if I could paint that great Church: "Fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," coming up out of the wilderness where she has long wandered "leaning upon the arm of her beloved."

I will not burden these pages with another word about the non-use of the Bible and the rarity of Gospel-preaching in Italy, for the habit of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to these things is well known among intelligent people. Neither do I care to enlarge upon the prevalent scepticism in Italy due to the corruptions of the Church further than to cite one illustration of it. On a recent Sabbath afternoon fifty thousand people assembled in Rome about the statue of Giordino Bruno and shouted to the echo their approval of an address of which this is a characteristic passage:

"We are here to-day to honor the memory of Giordino Bruno, the martyr. The Roman Catholic Church burned him, thinking thereby she could destroy the aspirations of the people for free thought. We must again renew our vows to fight to the death this Church, synonymous with reaction and tyranny. Atheism is the only power that will enable us to win the battle in which we are engaged."

This is one among many evidences of the loss of faith among the people and of its cause, which justifies the presence of a progressive, free and evangelizing Church in that most needy field.

The Archbishop says truly that "there is no State Church in America" and seems to imply that the American flag floating over our mission property is designed to give the Italians the impression that the Methodist is the American Church or that it may be a step in that direction. It is true that there is one Church in America that believes in the union of Church and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State and in the right of the Church to dominate the State, and it has approached that condition as nearly as public opinion will allow. It has withdrawn many of its children from the schools of the Republic, and they are being educated by a foreign cult in such studies and principles as it thinks proper. It is, by such influences as it brings to bear upon self-seeking politicians and venal legislators, obtaining large State appropriations for the support of its sectarian institutions in violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States and of the letter of the State constitutions. In the State of Pennsylvania, as well as in other States, it obtains hundreds of thousands of dollars every year for the support of its institutions in open violation of the constitution of the State, while the Methodist and other Protestant Churches refuse to accept any State money.

His Grace complains that Methodists in Italy antagonize the Pope and co-operate with those who are opposed to his pretensions. It is certainly not new to the Archbishop that there is a necessary and eternal antagonism between the fundamental principles of Methodism and the Papacy. The one stands for individualism, the other for paternalism, and these are contrary the one to the other. The key-note of modern civilization and progress is individualism, the discovery of the individual man, granting him liberty, investing him with responsibility, giving him the rights of a free conscience, empowering him with the franchise, and holding him accountable directly to God. This idea has advanced from the days of Luther and Wesley, knocking at all the doors of despotism, menacing the thrones of absolutism, breaking the fetters of the Dark Ages, casting off the archaic superstitions of an outgrown mediævalism, pulling down the unauthorized pretensions of civil and ecclesiastical rulers, and it has bidden man to go in his native freedom, as the birds in the heavens, doing God's will and remembering his accountability to Him. This is the ideal life, often abused I grant, but by it men have grown good, strong and great; in business, in politics and in ecclesiastical matters this idea is pregnant. Cast-iron Russia has been compelled to accept it; even the Turk has fallen in with the procession; France has risen in its might and thrown off the fetters that threatened its very life; poor belated and long-deceived Spain is awaking and struggling to be free from the Octopus that has been sucking out its life; sleepy little Portugal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is rubbing its eyes and asking that the light of this new day may shine on it also; and even rock-ribbed old Austria is beginning to stir itself with aspirations for the new life that is coming into the world. One man on the banks of the Tiber stands for the old absolutism and paternalism, and he is compelled to sit there moping as a self-styled "prisoner" because the nations of the earth have repudiated his idea and him with it. Of course the presence of Methodism in Italy has the aspect of opposition to the Pope, for it stands for the new and better life of the world, for the right of every man to read God's word, to get out of it his own meaning with the aid of such teachers as he wishes to consult, to make his own confessions and prayers to God without any intervening priest, to make his reconciliation with God and obtain absolution from Him who only has power to forgive sins, and to associate himself with such Church relations as promise him greatest spiritual help.

The old paternalism when pure had its mission in the infantile stage of development and intelligence, and there may be people who still need its service, but the race is rapidly moving away from it. There is not a virile, progressive nation on earth that has not or is not striving to cast it out of government and school; even Italy is a Protestant nation in many elements. Since Victor Emmanuel marched into Rome the feeble, broken, dishonored parts of the grand old race have come together into a splendid national life under the control of a liberal, patriotic Parliament and an enlightened King, and the Italian in any land may speak with just pride of the great nation that has Rome for its capital.

I hope the logic of this article will appear even to Archbishop Ireland. The conduct of the Methodists in Italy is the question, but to understand that we must know the conditions back of them, their world-wide connections and the issues to which they lead. I have the example of Jesus for the method of reasoning I have adopted. He said: "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" If I have been a little insistent in naming and defining the beams, it is because I know the skill of our friends on the other side in covering up and concealing ugly facts when they wish to bring a railing accusation against their neighbors.

S. M. VERNON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

LETTERS.

MILL'S "Autobiography"* will probably always remain the authentic document upon his life and mind, unless at some future date we should have the complete correspondence between himself and his family to which the present editor has had access. Totally lacking in what one would call personal charm, Mill is yet perennially interesting first because of his conscientious sincerity and, second, because he furnished a unique example of a man who received intellectual impressions of the world long before he received emotional ones. This may or may not have had something to do with his incapacity for many intimacies, and with the depth and intensity of the few affections that ruled his life. His life was uniquely intellectual. When he suffered from nervous depression, the matter that tormented him was "the exhaustibility of musical combinations. The octave consists only of five tones and two semi-tones, which can be put together in only a limited number of ways."

Miss Taylor's note on the morality of Mill's relation to Mrs. Taylor is rather fatuous and unpleasant. Few people, and those few little worthy of consideration and explanations, would be inclined to put a vulgar interpretation upon a relation kept upon so high a plane. Miss Taylor's note says little more than that Mrs. Taylor's husband and family were likewise clean-minded enough not to cast aspersions upon a companionship founded upon mental sympathy and congenial pursuits. This note does, however, throw some light on Mill's relation to his mother and upon the singular fact of his never once mentioning her in the "Autobiography." The most interesting of these letters are the

* "The Letters of John Stuart Mill." Edited with an Introduction by Hugh S. R. Elliot, with a note on Mill's private life by Mary Taylor. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

early ones to Carlyle, in which Mill comes as near as he ever did, outside the one relation, to being intimate and friendly. It is amusing to realize that he effected the introduction of Emerson to Carlyle and in the following terms:

"I had a note from Gustave d'Eichthal the other day, dated from Rome, merely to introduce an American named Emerson, who had sought an introduction to me as a means of obtaining one to you; this, of course, I gave him. . . . He appears to be a reader and admirer of your writings, therefore you might possibly do him some good; but from one or two conversations I have had with him, I do not think him a very hopeful subject."

One further reference to Emerson will suffice for that subject. Again he is writing to Carlyle and says:

"I know that *any* human being is interesting to you. Since you were so much pleased with Emerson, I feel encouraged to try you with almost any person who has any sort of good in him."

Mill's attitude toward Christ and Christianity, toward mysticism and the possible immortality of the soul, are all treated in these same letters to Carlyle and show how often it is the small followers of a great man who are rabid deniers and not often the great man himself.

"I have never believed Christianity as a religion, consequently have no habitual associations of reverence, nor, on the other hand, any *contempt* like so many sceptics who have been taught to believe."

In many places Mill emphasizes his profound reverence for Christ, though in one place he adds: "Respecting St. Paul, I have a very different feeling. I hold him to be the first great corrupter of Christianity." This view, not unusual in our own day, even amongst so-called Christians, seems odd and striking when we connect it with its date, 1849.

His feeling about Socialism comes out in a letter to John Jay thanking him for THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

"containing an article on my book. The article is laudatory enough to satisfy an appetite for praise much stronger than mine. But the writer is one whose tone of thinking and feeling is extremely repugnant to me. He gives a totally false idea of the book and of its author when he makes me a participant in the derision with which he speaks of Socialists of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all kinds and degrees. I have expressed temperately and argumentatively my objections to the particular plans proposed by Socialists to dispense with private property; but on many other important points I agree with them, and on none do I feel towards them anything but respect, thinking, on the contrary, that they are the greatest element of improvement in the present state of mankind."

To those who hoped in these letters to come at Mill's family correspondence and to know better the deep heart of this great and good man, this collection is a disappointment; on the other, the number of vital and important subjects, religious, humane and political, upon which he unburdens himself in this correspondence, is unexpectedly large, and the two volumes form an important addition to the literary and philosophical data of the mid-century.

It is no small good to have all of Shelley's letters* gathered into these two compact volumes that amount to more than one thousand pages and yet are light in the hand and convenient for reference. Nearly forty letters are quite new, more than fifty others have fresh matter, and some of Harriet's and Mary Shelley's explain or augment the evidence in difficult places. Mr. Ingpen is the most cautious of editors; he sets down everywhere the text without a grain of comment, and even in annotating he is content at critical places to quote or condense the notes of Professor Dowden, Peacock, Williams, etc. In a single case he is good enough to warn the reader that Hogg is untrustworthy in respect of the correspondence for which we must depend on him. Perhaps this is carrying a scruple too far and the idea of impartiality has led to the brink of suppression of evidence. The opinion of the man who has handled and studied the actual letters must be worth more than that based solely on the printed page; for there is much of real value in the written sheet, crowded or spaced wide, or crossed or recrossed, hurried or deliberate or agitated. If no one else's manuscript was ever so psychological as Lamb's, with its changes of script betraying where he left off and recommenced, yet Shelley's own handwriting might supply, so to speak, the overtones to some of the more difficult and ambiguous letters and resolve them into clearer harmony.

* "The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley." Collected and edited by Roger Ingpen. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We still need all the help conceivable to understand properly that complicated life and mysterious soul; the one so brief, so full of suffering and generous deeds; the other so intense, so tortured, so overflowing with love both human and ideal. Shelley was a profound Platonist; and he was homesick always for a nobler world than this; where, perhaps, "music and moonlight and feeling are one" and, furthermore, all discontent with the *less* supposes a sense of a just claim to the *greater*. It should be added to the credit of Shelley's admirable reason that he himself labelled this latter a Platonic sophism. He had, in prose, the clear mental processes and sound logical standards of that eighteenth century into which he was born and of which he was so characteristic a product, in his touching sense of the perfectibility of man's heart, the immanence of revolution, and the ultimate triumph of right reason. If in his poetry the solid structure of thought is veiled by misty moonlight effects, and the flicker of green and gold, by passion and beauty and mere quintessential poetry, it is no less present and discoverable. He would seem to have been a poet in the end almost in despite of himself; to have set greater store often by his controversial prose in philosophy and politics; to have uttered the poetry, like Plato's "Ion," in a kind of divine madness which he could neither explain nor estimate when he was out of the mood. Also he labored steadily in the preparation and discipline needful for a great work which, alas! he was destined never to undertake. He speaks lightly enough of this piece or that in the sight of the ideal beauty which he had. We praise it otherwise because we have only for comparison the poetry of other men.

The reading of these five hundred letters leaves as nothing else has ever done the profound sense of Shelley's unfulfilled renown. We see how slow he was in maturing, how tormented by bodily sickness, and we feel it is impossible to measure all that in the course of nature we were entitled to. At the outset he is an enthusiastic boy, devoured with ideas, often absurd, with the sort of absurdity we love and prize in the young as higher than any precocious wisdom or worldly prudence. His incredible generosity in matters of money and personal effort he never outgrew. It is inevitable, though vexatious, that those of his letters should have been kept most carefully which deal with business, but at least it gives us the chance to see how uniformly the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noney was for some one else's needs. There was a good deal of the Oriental in Shelley's make-up, nowhere more marked than in his disregard of worldly comfort, money and of ordinary company. Under the Bô-tree he would have fared happily and well. He says, once or twice, under the stress of unhappy companionship, that he cannot be happy with more than one person at a time—that that one gives either great pleasure or great pain. His rare humor is ironic, sometimes almost acrid and very Asiatic. His enthusiasms for stupid and selfish people when they die by the violence of intercourse leave him indeed disillusioned, but never at the point where all is vanity. His own saying on this matter of enthusiasm is the last word:

"I think one is always in love with something or other; the error, and I confess it is not easy for spirits encased in flesh and blood to avoid it, consists in seeking in a mortal image the likeness of what is perhaps eternal."

The vital thing that we learn afresh from these letters is that his courage was always greater than his strength and his gallantry than either. Upon his relations with women, the most difficult, intricate and dubious question in his short life, these letters throw a good deal of light and then fail. They clean out some mare's nests, one hopes, for good and all. The whole case of Elizabeth Hitchener, of Eliza Westbrooke and Mrs. Boonville, and even of poor, foolish Harriet herself, is plain enough. When it comes to Mrs. Gisborne, Mrs. Williams and Claire, we should like to know more and to see the Journal of Maria Gisborne which Mr. Buxton Forman possesses, but has not yet printed. As for Claire, it is not easy to believe her a trustworthy witness. Love-poems mean frankly anything or nothing. Most frequently they are an imaginative or imitative exercise. Such warm, kindly affection as Shelley sustained toward men and women is always susceptible of misconstruction. He has his own little joke about his fate to find in every town he inhabits "some lady of forty-five, very unprejudiced and philosophical, who has entered deeply into the best and selectest spirit of the age with enchanting manners and a disposition rather to like me." One thing is certain, whether Shelley talked philosophy or sentiment or made outright love to all the Marias and Janes and Emilies and Sophias and Amelias, no woman was less happy for his acquaintance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He gave joy and interest even where he carried away pain. Amid all the squalid quarrels of the Godwins and the sordid cares of the Hunts, and the baseness and vulgarity of the Westbrookes, and the flat dulness of his relatives, he stands unstained and unbefouled. Men and women alike leaned on him for daily bread and daily strength. His generosity was incredible; his power to soothe and enliven and encourage was almost as great. The kindest creature in the world, he knew himself reckoned a monster. A great lover, he knew that "some of us have in a prior existence been in love with an Antigone and that makes us find no full content in any mortal tie." Despite Mr. Ingpen and the late Matthew Arnold, to have kept company through these two volumes with this spirit, touched to finer issues, is to face life fortified by a larger charity, a keener sensibility, a nobler inner world than our own.

LITERARY STUDIES.

WHO would turn to a grammarian, of all men, for wit and gayety and vivacity? Professor Gildersleeve tells us in these lectures* that he has recently learned with a new shudder that some schools have classes in Gildersleeve, just as they have classes in conic sections, and he goes on plaintively to add: "I must say that I should not like to have my individuality merged in my Latin grammar and this sensible warm motion to become the kneaded clod of a crabbed text-book." And yet he makes an able and very witty plea for classical studies, since he says: "I myself have proved to my own satisfaction that the personal accountability for belief about which one hears so much nowadays is taught by a Greek negative, and that Schopenhauer's system is implicit in the only true doctrine of the Greek accusative. Do you wonder, then, that I am panoplied against the bird bolts that are aimed at grammar?"

The first lecture is a plea for classical studies, for Greek as one of the main channels through which life and culture flow; the second lecture concerns the relation of Greek literature to modern English literature; and the third is a highly interesting parallel

* "Hellas and Hesperia." Three lectures by Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between the Greeks of the great days and modern Americans. But the subjects are not of such moment; rather what one would note is the life, the wealth, the spirit with which Professor Gildersleeve endows everything he touches. The essays are thickly sown with wit and wisdom, ripe learning and lenient vision. A few observations culled at random should be enough to assure each reader that he must own the volume.

"It is better to be a doorkeeper in the house of philology than to dwell in the tents of the rhetorician."

"Some men can pass from the morning newspaper or the midnight novel straight to the lecture on Greek literature or to the investigation of grammatical phenomena and feel that life is one; others have to put on mental bands and gowns in order to present the gospel of Hellenism, as Buffon is said to have put on court dress before he paid his respects to Nature; others regard a Greek joke as a sacred thing not likely to be laughed at."

"Creon tells his son Hæmon that Antigone is 'a frigid hugging-piece,' and however frigid my hugging-piece (the Greek language) may seem to others, I have pursued it as a phantom of delight, now through the crowds of the agora, now round the steps of the bema, now over the meadows of the Muses where Aristophanes disports himself, now over battle-fields illuminated by stark figures of the blue and gray."

English reviewers are reproaching American essayists with taking themselves too seriously. The same reproach might be brought against our scholars. They are so serious that they are positively dry. Dr. Jebb, Dr. Mahaffy, Mr. Tyrrell, can write of Greek life and letters with profound learning and yet be interesting. One has a sense that they have had time to assimilate what they have learned. Why must our college professors produce books that read like so much newly gathered learning carefully catalogued? "This book,"* says the author, "is a contribution to the study of Greek education during imperial times." For the real spirit of Greek education we should still refer the reader to Thomas Davidson's fascinating volume. The chapters on "Public Displays" and "Student Days" are most interesting and least overburdened by a mere catalogue of facts.

* "The Universities of Ancient Greece." By John M. Walden. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These delightful and learned essays* have but one thread of continuity—all deal with Greek literature. The five essays spread over so wide ground as Pindar, Sophocles, the recently discovered Papyri (the Constitution of Athens), Bachalydes and Plutarch. Of these the least technical and most appealing to the general reader is the delightfully interesting essay on Sophocles. Like Professor Gildersleeve, Mr. Tyrrell delights us by scraps of wit on his most profound pages, as when in his denunciation of the lack of taste and imagination in German scholarship he suggests as an adjunct to the Decalogue: "Thou shalt not covet the German's knife, nor his readings, nor his metres, nor his sense, nor his taste, nor anything that is his."

Some of the discussion of readings and interpretations is a matter for scholars only, but the gist of the book is thoroughly enjoyable reading and reliable scholarship. It is devoutly to be desired that this author should collect into one volume his essays on English poetry and give us a volume as learned and delightful as this in a more familiar field.

* "Essays on Greek Literature." By Robert Yelverton Tyrrell. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED